

All Offerors must acknowledge receipt of this amendment by inserting Amendment Number 01 and date in Block 14 of the original SF 33 with your proposal submission.

For conformity purposes, Solicitation GS00Q-13-DR-0002 and Attachments J.1. through J.10. are replaced in their entirety by this Amendment 01.

This Amendment 01 addresses a subset of questions received in response to the solicitation. This amendment also provides a number of edits to the original solicitation. Offerors should review all documents and changes carefully.

In accordance with FAR 15.201(f), the questions and answers being shared are questions that could potentially impact the preparation of proposals in response to the solicitations. Comments, recommendations, and other feedback/questions received have been considered, but are not included. The OASIS Program Office has received a high volume of questions and feedback and will provide additional questions and answers as soon as possible.

The Solicitation closing date of TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17th, 2013; 4:00 P.M., CENTRAL DAYLIGHT TIME (CDT) remains unchanged.

THE PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT 01 IS TO:

- (1) Summarize the changes that were made to the solicitation;
- (2) Answer questions from prospective Offerors;
- (3) Re-issue a complete conformed solicitation (Sections A through M, including all Attachments in Section J)

AMENDMENT 01 SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The following summarizes the changes to the solicitation by each section under Amendment 01, however, Offerors are advised to read the Amendment 01 solicitation and attachments in their entirety.

SF 33:

1. Block 9 of the SF 33 is revised to read "Sealed Offerors in original and 0 copies". Only 1 original DVD is required to be submitted in accordance with Section L.4.

SECTION A:

1. All terms and conditions in Section A remain unchanged.

SECTION B:

1. All terms and conditions in Section B remain unchanged.

SECTION C:

1. All terms and conditions in Section C remain unchanged.

SECTION D:

1. All terms and conditions in Section D remain unchanged.

SECTION E:

1. All terms and conditions in Section E remain unchanged.

SECTION F:

1. Section F.4.1. revises the location for Deliverable and Reporting requirements from OASIS@gsa.gov to OASISSB@gsa.gov
2. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION G:

1. Section G.3.3. Subcontracting Plan was revised to clarify that the Contractor's Subcontracting Plan is inclusive of the OASIS program as whole, however, the reporting of goals is done at the individual pool level.
2. Section G.3.2.4. CAF Payment Data was updated to allow for consolidation of CAF across all awarded Pools.
3. Section G.3.5. Insurance was updated to allow Insurance coverage inclusive of all awarded Pools.
4. Section G.3.6. Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-Of-Name Agreements was updated to allow notification inclusive of all awarded Pools.
5. Section G.3.7. FAPIIS was updated to each Pool a Contractor has an award under.
6. Section G.3.8. VETS-100A Reports was updated to allow reporting inclusive of all awarded Pools.
7. Section G.3.9. FSRs Reports was updated to allow FSRs reports inclusive of all awarded Pools.
8. Section G.3.10. was revised to update the term CCR to SAM.
9. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION H:

1. Section H.8 Sustainability was revised to encourage updating of sustainability disclosures.
2. Section H.10. Limitations on Subcontracting was revised to allow OCOs to tailor Limitations on Subcontracting at the task order level, when applicable.

3. Section H.11.4 Marketing was revised to make the review of marketing material mandatory.
4. Section H.11.5. Minimum Task Order Awards or Estimated Value was revised to make the requirement of meeting the minimum number of task order awards or estimated value at the OASIS program level as whole in lieu of each individual Pool.
5. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION I:

1. SECTION I.1. Task Order Clauses is revised to clarify how clauses/provisions apply at the task order level.
2. The following clauses have been deleted from Section I:

FAR 52.204-7	Central Contractor Registration	DEC 2012
--------------	---------------------------------	----------

3. The following clauses have been added or updated in Section I:

FAR 52.204-13	System for Award Management Maintenance	JUL 2013
FAR 52.209-6	Protecting the Governments Interest When Subcontracting With Contractors Debarred, Suspended, or Proposed for Debarment	AUG 2013
FAR 52.209-9	Updates of Publicly Available Information Regarding Responsibility Matters	JUL 2013
FAR 52.215-16	Facilities Capital Cost of Money	JUN 2003
FAR 52.219-8	Utilization of Small Business Concerns	JUL 2013
FAR 52.219-9	Small Business Subcontracting Plan	JUL 2013
FAR 52.219-28	Post-Award Small Business Program	JUL 2013
	Re-representation	
FAR 52.222-54	Employment Eligibility Verification	AUG 2013
FAR 52.225-26	Contractors Performing Private Security Functions Outside the United States	JUL 2013
FAR 52.229-3	Federal, State, and Local Taxes	FEB 2013
FAR 52.232-33	Payment by Electronic Funds Transfer-System For Award Management	JUL 2013
FAR 52.244-6	Subcontracts For Commercial Items	JUL 2013

SECTION J:

SECTION J.1. LABOR CATEGORIES AND DEFINITIONS – Attachment (1)

1. All terms and conditions in Section J.1. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.2. DIRECT LABOR RATE RANGES – Attachment (2)

1. Labor Category #103 Low and High Direct Labor Rate was revised to: \$46.21 for Low and \$47.08 for High

2. Labor Category #104 Low and High Direct Labor Rate was revised to: \$55.06 for Low and \$61.21 for High
3. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION J.3. POOL IDENTIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION – Attachment (3)

1. Pool Application was revised to read: Pool Qualification
2. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION J.4. PROPOSAL CHECKLIST – Attachment (4)

1. Volume 1 – General, Question #2, Pool Application was revised to read: Pool Qualification
2. Volume 3 – Relevant Experience #2, Attachment J.8. was revised to read: Attachment J.10.
3. Volume 4 – Past Experience was revised to read: Past Performance
4. Volume 4 – Past Performance, Questions 1, 2 and 3 were updated to include Pool Qualification Projects
5. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION J.5.1. SELF SCORING WORKSHEET FOR (PROPOSAL SUBMISSION) – Attachment (5A)

1. All terms and conditions in Section J.5.1. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.5.2. SELF SCORING WORKSHEET (SAMPLE ONLY) – Attachment (5B)

1. All terms and conditions in Section J.5.2. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.6. MODIFIED PRE-AWARD SURVEY (SF 1408) – Attachment (6)

1. All terms and conditions in Section J.6. remain unchanged.

SECTION J.7. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE (PRIMARY) TEMPLATE – Attachment (7)

1. Under General Instruction #5 is revised to remove “in yellow” and replace it with “highlighted/identified”
2. Letter of Commitment is revised to remove “Letter of Commitment” to “Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter”
3. Under Background Information, Question #7, What is the TYPE OF VEHICLE?” is updated to include the block for a Task Order under a Federal Supply Schedule in accordance with FAR 8.405-2
4. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION J.8. PAST PERFORMANCE RATING FORM – Attachment (8)

1. All terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION J.9. COST/PRICE TEMPLATE – Attachment (9)

1. All terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION J.10. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE (SECONDARY) TEMPLATE – Attachment (10)

1. Under Multiple Award Contracts/Task Orders a “Not Applicable” Block was added to the choices of answers.
2. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged

SECTION K:

1. Section K has been updated and renumbered and includes instructions on how to submit Section K with the Offeror’s proposal. **Offeror’s must use the Amendment 01 Section K with their proposal submission.**
2. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION L:

Offerors are strongly advised to read Section L, Amendment 01, in its entirety. The following are a general summary of changes.

1. For consistency purposes only, a global change was made to the term Pool Application. Pool “Application” has been revised to read Pool “Qualification” throughout all the solicitation documents.
2. Section L.1. has been updated to include the following provision:

FAR 52.204-7 System for Award Management JUL 2013
3. Section L.3., is revised to allow minor formatting changes to the Section K template and Section J templates
4. Section L.3.2., Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of Name Agreements, has been revised in its entirety to clarify how Pool Qualification, Primary, and Secondary projects and past performance for Pool Application and Primary Projects are accounted for under a novation.
5. Section L.4., Proposal Format Table has been updated to provide additional proposal submission guidance and to correct errors.
6. Section L.5., Proposal Content, was added to clarify that all projects and past performance must have been performed as a **Prime** Contractor only.
7. Section L.5.1.1., Standard Form (SF) 33, paragraph 2, has been revised to make a correction on the form blocks to read, “the Offeror shall fill out the blocks 12 through 18 accordingly”
8. Offerors are advised to read Section L.5.1.2, Pool Qualification and Certification, in its entirety under Amendment 01. The following is a general summary of changes:
 - Pool Qualification and Certification has been updated to allow the 2002 predecessor NAICS Code of 541710 for Pool Qualification Projects under Pools 4, 5A, 5B, and 6.
 - Pool Qualification and Certification has been revised to correct a typographical error from “See Section L.5.3 for details” to “See Section L.5.4 for details”
 - Pool Qualification and Certification has been updated to clarify that the 2002 predecessor NAICS Code of 541710, qualifies for Pools 4, 5A, 5B, and 6.

- Pool Qualification and Certification has been updated to allow for NAICS Codes **or Product Service Codes (PSC)** for Pool Qualification purposes.
9. Section L.5.1.7., Modified Pre-Award Survey (SF 1408), has been updated to clarify that the Offeror must not contact DCAA in regards to this solicitation, does not need a DCAA audit of their accounting system prior to the solicitation closing date, GSA will provide DCAA a copy of the SF 1408 and DCAA will schedule audits, if necessary, and that GSA reserves the right to not request a DCAA determination of an Offeror's accounting system, if the Offeror is not otherwise eligible for award.
 10. Section L.5.1.8., Subcontracting Plan, was updated to clarify that regardless of the number of Pools the Offeror is eligible for award under, the Offeror must only submit 1 Subcontracting Plan that covers all the Pools applied for.
 11. Section L.5.2.1. Financial Resources, has been revised in its entirety to include instructions on how to fill out a GSA Form 527.
 12. Offerors are advised to read Section L.5.3.1., Pass/Fail Requirements for Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects in its entirety under Amendment 01. The following is a general summary of changes:
 - A "collection of task orders" under a Single-Award IDIQ or BPA has been updated to clarify how the Pass/Fail and Additional Points will be determined.
 - This Section clarifies that Subcontracts are **not** considered Commercial Projects for the purposes of this solicitation
 - This Section re-iterates that each Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects must have been performed as a Prime Contractor or existing CTA.
 - The Example under Number 3 has been revised to correct typographical errors and to clarify how project value is determined on stand-alone projects and a project that includes a "collection of task orders" under a Single-Award IDIQ or BPA.
 13. Section L.5.3.1 Pass/Fail Requirements for Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects is revised to clarify language regarding a collection of task orders and period of performance.
 14. Section L.5.3.2., and Section's L.5.3.2.1 through L.5.3.2.8, Additional Points for Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects, is updated to clarify how additional points will be determined under a "collection of task orders" and to clarify that an Offeror must limit the number of task orders submitted as a single projects to only the number of task orders necessary to achieve the total maximum number of points for that project.
 15. Section L.5.3.3.1., Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Mission Spaces, has been revised to correct the following typographical errors:
 - Paragraph 3, is revised from: "See Section M.5.2.11 for the 5 Mission Spaces: to: "See Section M.1.10. for the 5 Mission Spaces".
 - DD 1155 has been corrected by deleting the reference to Block 16 and adding the reference to Blocks 3 and 6 respectively.

16. Section L.5.3.3.2., Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Multiple Award Contracts/BPAs and Task Orders, has been revised to correct the following typographical error:
 - DD 1155 has been corrected by deleting the reference to Block 16 and adding the reference to Blocks 3 and 6 respectively.
17. Section L.5.4., Volume 4 – Past Performance has been rewritten in its entirety to explain how past performance is determined for Pool Qualification Projects, Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects, and a “collection of task orders” Project under a Single-Award IDIQ or BPA.

SECTION M:

Offerors are strongly advised to read Section M, Amendment 01, in its entirety. The following are a general summary of changes.

1. Section M.5.1.1., Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects under an OASIS NAICS Code, Example 1, 2, and 3 points have been corrected to read **750** points, **600** points, and **300** points respectively.
2. Section M.3. Screening and Evaluation Process, has been updated to include how a given socio-economic group would be handled if that given group does not have three Offerors eligible for award.
3. Section M.5.1.2. Relevant Experience (Primary) Project Value, Number 1, was corrected to read “Project averages greater than **\$2** Million on an annual basis but, less than \$4 Million on an annual basis, including options”.
4. Section M.5.1.3. Relevant Experience (Primary) Project Value with Performance/Integration of Additional Core Disciplines, paragraph 1 was corrected to read: **Four (4)** out of the Six (6) OASIS SB Core Disciplines; **Five (5)** out of the Six (6) OASIS SB Core Disciplines or, if the project involve the performance and/or integration of all **Six (6)** OASIS SB Core Disciplines respectively”.
5. Section M.5.1.4. Relevant Experience (Primary) Project with Multiple Locations, last paragraph has been revised to read:

“Travel Duty (TDY) assignments for contract employees does **not** count for any location. All performance locations must be supported and verifiable through contract documentation”

6. Section M.5.2., Volume 4 – Past Performance was updated to clarify that past performance applies to both Pool Qualification Projects and Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects
7. Section M.6. Scoring Table is revised to correct a typographical error for Section L.5.3.2.2. Total Max Points Per Element to read **250** points, **375** points, and **500** points respectively.

AMENDMENT 01 QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

The following are questions were submitted in response to the solicitation. Duplicative questions that were submitted are not always repeated.

SF 33

1. Question: The SF 33 says 1 original and one copy. Section L. 4, 2nd paragraph says to submit all information on 1 DVD. Does GSA want 1 or 2 copies of the proposal delivered?

Response: 1 original and 0 copies. See Amendment 01 to the solicitation. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

SECTION B

2. Question: Section B.2.1 Labor Categories: Will the government please provide the link to BLS published data that determined the labor rate ranges. Industry needs to verify that the ranges are accurate

Response: The ranges provided are for Government use in determining fair and reasonable pricing. We have shared this information with potential Offerors for consideration and ease. However, the information is found at: http://www.bls.gov/soc/major_groups.htm

3. Question: Section B.3.1 Specialized Labor Categories. How will you report the Specialized Labor Categories in the OASIS Management Module? Will that be an editable field?

Response: Those instructions will be provided after award. The system is currently being created.

SECTION C

4. Question: Section C.3. Please clarify your definition of Non-IT. Under the current definition, it seems to include bolt on systems that are not a part of a command and control system. We believe these bolt on systems should be included in ancillary support.

Response: The definitions of IT and non-IT come from the Clinger Cohen Act. Any determination of "bolt on" components would have to be evaluated on a case by case basis.

SECTION F

5. Question: Section F.4.2, Compliance. Items H.6.6 through H.6.10 state the "Contractor shall" with regard to industry certifications. This conflicts with the instructions found in section H.6, Systems, Certifications, and Clearances which indicates that these elements are not necessary, but that Contractors are encouraged to have such certification and or capability. Would the Government please provide clarification as to whether this is a requirement necessary for submission and award.

Response: Every single one of those citations clearly state that those items are not mandatory.

SECTION G.2.6. Contractor Key Personnel

6. Question: Section G.2.6, Contractor Key Personnel. The Corporate OASIS Program Manager (COPM) and Corporate OASIS Contract Manager (COCM) requirements do not appear in Sections L or M, nor in Attachment 5, the Self Scoring Worksheet. Please clarify if any personnel information is required with the submission. If so, please provide instructions on content, format, and proposal submission location.

Response: No information regarding Key Personnel is required with the proposal submission. Key Personnel will be identified after award.

SECTION G.3.2.1. Task Order Award Data

7. Question: Section G.3.2.1. Is the requirements in this section only for Direct Order Direct (DOD) Bill type Task Orders? For orders awarded in IT-Solutions why can't this data be retrieved by the government and populated in to the OMM? Will all the data points in section G.3.2.1 be in the OMM? Will you be able to upload the electronic copies of the TO and Solicitation?

Response: We are hopeful that orders processed through ITSS will automatically populate into the OMM, but we cannot verify that yet. In the event it does not, the requirement will apply to all orders.

SECTION G.3.2.4. CAF Payment Data

8. Question: Section G.3.1 and G.3.2.4 CAF Remittance. Will the CAF reporting apply only at the master contract level or at each individual MA-IDIQ contract level?

Response: Across all awarded Pools.

SECTION G.3.3. Subcontracting Plan

9. Question: G.3.3 Individual Subcontracting Reports (ISR) - In the event a company is awarded contracts in multiple pools, does the Individual Subcontracting reporting need to be reported for each separate contract or only once for the 'family of contracts known as OASIS'?

Response: ISRs will need to be reported for each Pool. See Amendment 01.

10. Question: G.3.3 Summary Subcontracting Reports (SSR) - In the event a company is awarded contracts in multiple pools, does the Summary Subcontracting reporting need to be reported for each separate contract or only once for the 'family of contracts known as OASIS'?

Response: SSRs are agency reports and should consolidate all contracts.

11. Question: The RFP states: "The Contractor shall submit Individual Subcontract Reports (ISR) for Individual Subcontracting Plans, if applicable, and Summary Subcontract Reports (SSR) using the web-based eSRS at <http://www.esrs.gov>." eSRS does not now support reporting for task orders, nor for affiliates. Will GSA confirm that it will work with industry partners and others to address this issue after contract award?

Response: Yes.

SECTION G.3.5. Insurance

12. Question: G.3.5 Insurance - In the event a company is awarded contracts in multiple pools, does a separate Certificate of Insurance need to be provided for each separate contract or can one be submitted for the 'family of contracts known as OASIS'?

Response: One for the "family of contracts"

SECTION G.3.6. Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations And Change-Of Name-Agreements

13. Question: G.3.6 Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements - In the event a company is awarded contracts in multiple pools, does a separate notification (if applicable) need to be submitted for each separate contract or can one be submitted for the 'family of contracts known as OASIS'??

Response: Once for the family of contracts.

SECTION G.3.7. Responsibility and FAPIIS

14. Question: G.3.7 Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS) - In the event a company is awarded contracts in multiple pools, does FAPIIS reporting need to be done each separate contract or can it be submitted once for the 'family of contracts known as OASIS'??

Response: FAPIIS information will need to be reported for each Pool.

SECTION G.3.8. VETS-100 Reports

15. Question: G.3.8 VETS 100-A - In the event a company is awarded contracts in multiple pools, does VETS 100-A reporting need to be submitted for each separate contract or can it be submitted once for the 'family of contracts known as OASIS'??

Response: Once for the family of contracts.

SECTION G.3.9. FSRs Reports

16. Question: Reporting Executive Compensation and First-Tier Subcontract Awards - In the event a company is awarded contracts in multiple pools, does FFATA reporting need to be submitted for each separate contract or can it be submitted once for the 'family of contracts known as OASIS'??

Response: This information will need to be reported for each Pool.

SECTION H.6. Systems, Certifications, and Clearances

17. Question: H.6. "Systems, Certifications, and Clearances"; H.6.1. "Acceptable Accounting System"; L.5.1.7. "Modified Pre-Award Survey". Question: Under the OASIS Draft Solicitation it was stated that a "Cognizant Federal Agency (CFA) or an independent accounting firm" [L.5.1.5 "Acceptable Accounting System"] or "other auditing entity" [H.6.1. "Adequate Accounting System"] could provide the Acceptable Accounting System audit report for a contractor's offer. Under the OASIS Final Solicitation, in one section it states that the offeror's Accounting System should be approved by DCAA ("Only those Contractors that maintain an acceptable accounting system, as approved by DCAA, shall be eligible for task order solicitations"), while under section, the Modified Pre-Award Survey, it

appears to indicate that the approval may come from a "CPA/Consultant, or other Cognizant Federal Agency other than DCAA" as well. Could the Government please clarify that a third-party audit report is acceptable?

Response: Third party audits are NOT acceptable. DCAA will be conducting pre-award accounting system audits (as necessary) for all apparent successful Offerors who do not already have an approved accounting system.

SECTION H.10. Limitations on Subcontracting

18. Question H.10 Limitations on Subcontracting - The Limitations on Subcontracting provision in the solicitation states that "at least 50% of the cost of task order performance incurred for personnel shall be expended by the OASIS SB Prime Contractor." Will this be revised to reflect the 2013 National Defense Authorization Act which, for service contracts, states that compliance with the limitations on subcontracting will be based on the total contract cost, rather than the cost of the contract incurred for just personnel, and which also permits the Small Business to meet its performance requirements by subcontracting to other small businesses?

Response: No. Task orders placed by OCOs subject to the NDAA may include this at the task order level. However, the referenced citation is not applicable to all task orders. See Section H.10., Amendment 01, to the solicitation.

SECTION H.11.5. Minimum Task Order Awards or Estimated Value

19. Question: Section H.11.5 Minimum Task Order Awards or Estimated Value. Is the requirement across all 7 pools or at the individual pool MAIDIQ Contract Level?

Response: Not per pool but, across all Pools combined.

SECTION I Contract Clauses

20. Question: Please confirm that these clauses are accurate: 52.204-7 dated DEC 2012 versus 52.204-7 dated JUL 2012; 52.204-10 Dated JUN 2013 versus 52.204-10 Dated JUL 2013; 52.209-6 Dated DEC 2010 versus 52.209-6 Dated AUG 2013; 52.209-9 Dated FEB 2012 versus 52.209-9 dated JUL 2013; 52.219-9 dated JAN 2011 versus 52.219-9 dated JUL 2013; 52.219-9 Alternate II dated OCT 2001 versus 52.219-9 Alternate II dated JUL 2010; 52.219-28 dated APR 2012 versus 52.219-28 dated JUL 2013; 52.222-54 dated JUL 2012 versus 52.222-54 dated AUG 2013; 52.229-3 dated APR 2003 versus 52.229-3 dated FEB 2013; 52.232-33 dated OCT 2003 versus 52.232-33 dated JUL 2013; 52.244-6 dated DEC 2010 versus 52.244-6 dated JUL 2013.

Response: The clauses/provisions listed in the solicitation summary section of this document identifies which clauses/provisions will be updated. See Amendment 01 to the solicitation. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

21. Question: B.2.5.1 addresses the ability for an OCO to award T&M/LH Commercial Item Acquisition task orders but there are no FAR Part 12 clauses listed in Section I. Is this an oversight?

Response: Section I.1. has been amended for clarification regarding task order clauses. The Section I clauses under Section I.2. only apply to the Master IDIQ task order contracts. Thanks for bringing this to our attention..

22. Question: Sections I.2 and L.6.3. Section I.2 has the FCCOM Waiver 52.215-17; Section L.6.3 gives instructions on adding FCCOM to the template. Please incorporate FAR 52.215-16 FCCOM

Response: Amendment 01 will include both FAR 52.215-16 and FAR 52.215-17. Offerors must follow whichever clause is applicable to their own internal cost accounting procedures as it relates to Facilities Capital Cost of Money.

23. Question: The solicitation includes FAR 52.215-17 "Waiver of Facilities Capital Cost of Money" (FCCM) which states "The Contractor did not include facilities capital cost of money as a proposed cost of this contract. Therefore, it is an unallowable cost under this contract." However, the example provided in the Cost/Pricing Template instructions (L.6.3) references contractors adding FCCM to their indirect rate structure. Was FAR 52.215-16 "Facilities Capital Cost of Money" that allows the inclusion of FCCM if the criteria for allowability in FAR 31.205-10(b) are met inadvertently omitted from the solicitation?

Response: Answer pending.

SECTION J.2., Attachment (2)

24. Question: Reference: J.2. DIRECT LABOR RATE RANGES – Attachment (2)

Offeror has noticed what appear to be administrative errors for the Low and/or High Direct Labor Rates specified for the labor category titles *Senior Scientists and Science Technicians Group 5* (Labor ID #103) and *SME – Scientists and Science Technicians Group 5* (Labor ID #104). For both labor categories, the "High" rate is less than the respective "Low" rate. Can the Government please confirm that the intended direct labor rate ranges for OASIS labor categories are being provided in Attachment J.2?

Response: This is a typographical error. The numbers for those two levels are transposed. See Amendment 01 to the solicitation. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

25. Question: Attachment 2, All Pages, Various Labor ID #'s: The delta between the Low and High rates varies from 2% (for Position ID# 68) to 132% (for Position ID# 86). Why is there a large variation from the Low to High ranges among all of the Position IDs?

Response: Because the variations differ for each SOC and groups of SOCs. Some are more uniform when comparing the National information and the High State Information and some have a wide gap between the two.

26. Question: Attachment 2 is titled as "Direct Labor Rate Ranges". Please confirm that these are in fact "Direct Labor Rates" and not "Fully Burdened Rates".

Response: These are in fact Direct Labor Rates and not Fully Burdened Rates

SECTION J.3., Attachment (3)

27. Question: Section J.3. In the Page Limit column and the Example File Name column of the Proposal Format Table in the 2nd row (L.5.1.2), we interpret the instruction to mean that Offerors are to electronically attach evidence of two Pool Qualification projects directly to Attachment 3 (J.3 Pool Qualification and Certification). It appears that this is only one of two instructions that does not require Offerors to submit these files separately (vice attaching them all to the Attachment) and name them in accordance with the naming convention in the Example File Name column. Is our interpretation of this correct?

Response: No. This is an error corrected in Amendment 01 to the solicitation. Provide all documents in accordance with the Proposal Format Table in L.4. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

SECTION J.4., Attachment (4)

28. Question: Attachment J.4: Volume 3, paragraph 2; Volume 4, paragraph 3. Volume 3, item 2 references a Relevant Experience (Secondary) Project Template. Is Attachment 10 the correct reference for this template?

Response: Yes. This is an error corrected in Amendment 01 to the solicitation. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

29. Question: Given that the government has defined a “relevant experience project as a collection of task orders”, why is the government asking in Section J.4 (Attachment 4) Proposal Checklist #3, that the offeror supply a completed Attachment J.8 for “EACH project from a collection of task orders under a Single-Award IDIQ Contract or BPA?” Will the government consider amending the J.4 instructions on #3 to read “Does your offer include a Past Performance Rating Form (Survey) for any of the Five (5) Relevant Experience Primary Projects, including the relevant experience project formed from a collection of task orders under a Single-Award IDIQ Contract or BPA?”

Response: Because not all IDIQ task orders are issued by the same office and/or same contracting officer. For the purposes of core discipline identification and past performance, we are allowing up to 6 task orders to be identified.

SECTION J.5., Attachment (5)

30. Question: When submitting one (1) Project Reference that includes a collection of task orders, do we need to show a 3.5 performance rating for each task order being submitted by either a CPAR or Past Performance Rating Form (J8)? How do we calculate the scoring in order to determine the single number to be entered for this project reference in the J5, Self-Scoring Spreadsheet when using the collection of tasks orders?

Response: See section M.5.2.4. (Project 5) for an example of how to score past performance on a collection of task orders.

SECTION J.7., Attachment (7)

31. Question: Volume 3, Section J.7, Attachment (7), Question 4. Prime Contractor Name, Note to Question 4 states, “If the contract/task order was awarded under a different name than the Offeror, then the Offeror shall provide a copy of a Letter of Commitment or Novation Agreement as applicable.” Does this “Letter of Commitment” refer to the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters that are also required in Volume 1 for every proposal evaluation element? Please clarify if this is a different letter of commitment than that required in Volume 1 and describe the requirements for this letter. If these letters are the same as those required in Volume 1, please confirm that GSA wants these letter attached again in Volume 3.

Response: They are the same letters. Amendment 01 to the solicitation corrects this. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

32. Question: Ref. Attachment 7, Section 4: This section of the Relevant Experience (Primary) Project Template is unclear as to whether or not small businesses can use subcontract references as a relevant experience (primary) project. Section 4 asks the offeror “Who is the PRIME CONTRACTOR?” Under the asterisked note in the same section there is a specification to provide Letters of Commitment if the name of the prime contractor and the offeror are different. Please clarify what is required in a Commitment Letter. In addition, are we allowed to submit subcontract references that meet all other past performance project criteria as primary projects?

Response: No subcontract information may be provided for any proposal submission element. This is clarified in Amendment 01 to the solicitation.

33. Question: Section J.7, Attachment (7), General Instructions paragraph, states that the offeror must provide scanned excerpt(s) from verifiable contractual documentation which are highlighted to substantiate specific information. If a single page substantiates more than one area (example: "Prime Contractor Name" and "Period of Performance" does the Government want that page provided twice – once for each piece of requested information?

Response: No, the Offeror may indicate that the same page validates more than one proposal element.

34. Question: Section J.7 Attachment 7, Relevant Experience Project 5 Alternate – Scoring Related Information: asks "What is the ANNUAL AVERAGE DOLLAR VALUE PER YEAR of all Task Orders placed under the IDIQ/BPA?" However, Section L.5.3.1, of the Solicitation, states that "one (1) out of the five (5) required relevant experience projects may be a collection of task orders placed under a Single-Award IDIQ task order contract or Single-Award BPA. A "**collection of task orders**" shall not exceed a total of **6 task orders**."

For a Single-Award IDIQ or BPA that has more than 6 task orders, do we use the annual average dollar value per year of ALL the task orders, as it states in Attachment 7, or just a collection of 6 of the task orders?

Response: The dollar value should include all task orders. The limitation of 6 task orders applies to Past Performance and identification of core disciplines.

35. Question: Section J.7. This templates instructions state "*All requested information shall be highlighted in yellow within the scanned documents.*" Since the government is asking for documents for which the only accessible source may be the record working copies held in the offeror's own company files, occasionally some of the documents requested may already contain yellow highlighting and margin markings - and not in the areas of interest to the OASIS RFP. In these rare instances, how would you like for an offeror to "highlight" the relevant information in order to streamline OASIS screening and verification?

Response: We've removed the word "yellow". Highlighting may be of any color, but Offeror's are to be clear as to what is highlighted for the purposes of proposal submission and how the required highlights have been applied.

36. Question: Question 7 of the Relevant Experience (Primary) Project Template asks "What is the TYPE OF VEHICLE? (Check only one)." Several of the Relevant Experience projects that we plan to submit were competed and awarded through a GSA Schedule (for example, LOGWORLD). We are trying to determine if we should select Option 1: CONTRACT (not a Task Order) or Option 2: TASK ORDER UNDER A MASTER IDIQ TASK ORDER CONTRACT (FAR 16.501-1). We reviewed the FAR reference and still are unsure. We're not sure if GSA considers Schedules "MASTER IDIQ TASK ORDER CONTRACT." We note that on the award document (SF 1449) it usually lists the contract number for our Schedule as the Contract Number, and the specific award number (for the customer) as the Order Number. Given this scenario, are we correct to assume that projects awarded via GSA Schedules should be considered Option 2: TASK ORDER UNDER A MASTER IDIQ TASK ORDER CONTRACT?

Response: That is correct.

37. Question: Attachment 7, Relevant Experience (Primary) Project Template, Question #8, "Does the project involve SUBCONTRACTING or TEAMING?" This item requires documentation to validate/substantiate our subcontracting assertion. Is it correct to assume that highlighted excerpts of the actual subcontract documents or task orders showing the prime contract and/or order numbers will fulfill the requirement?

Response: Any documentation necessary to demonstrate the subcontracting or teaming that was actually performed is acceptable.

38. Question: Section J.7. With regard to “Offeror must provide excerpts of contract documentation that substantiate...” would the Government please clarify the type of information, the format and the depth and breadth expected in providing these “excerpts”?

Response: This means any evidence within a contract or task order document or other verifiable contractual documents to support each answer.

39. Question: Request clarification in the document titled: SECTION_J.7.,_ATT._(7),_OASIS_SB_RELEVANT_EXPERIENCE_(PRIMARY)_TEMPLATE”. In the section titled “RELEVANT EXPERIENCE PROJECT 5 ALTERNATE – SCORING RELATED INFORMATION”, sub-paragraph 2 it states, “2. What is the ANNUAL AVERAGE DOLLAR VALUE PER YEAR of the project? (Check only one)” Request clarification on what “project” this question is referring to – since it is a “collection of task orders”.

Response: The annual dollar value of the project for IDIQ/BPAs is the collective total of all task orders performed under the IDIQ/BPA.

SECTION J.8. Attachment (8)

40. Question: Past Performance Rating Form (Survey). Is Attachment 8 the correct reference for this form?

Response: Yes.

41. Question: The draft attachment for Past Performance Surveys was J.6. In the final solicitation is J.8. Can we use our returned J6’s from our clients now that it is J8 in the final?

Response: Yes, you may use the previous attachment J.6. form for a past performance survey from the draft solicitation for proposal submission if your client has already completed it. There is no change in the form content, so this is acceptable. However, if an interim or final PPIRS has been completed on a project, PPIRS takes precedence over any past performance survey.

42. Question: Our company is planning to respond to both the SB and Unrestricted RFPs. We plan to use the same contract/order for a pool qualification project under both RFPs. RFP Attachment 8 (PAST PERFORMANCE RATING FORM) is identical in both RFPs except for the header information. Can we use the same form for both the SB and Unrestricted proposals or do we need to submit separate forms for each? In other words, does the Government POC complete two (2) Past Performance Rating forms with the same information?

Response: You may use the same past performance rating form if proposing on both OASIS SB and OASIS Unrestricted. The header is meaningless as long as the information is correct.

SECTION J.10. Attachment (10)

43. Question: In the Final RFP, Section J.10, Attachment (10), the MULTIPLE AWARD CONTRACTS/TASK ORDERS: section states, “1. How many Multiple Award Contracts are you providing in your proposal? (Select One)”. If none of the options are applicable, should we leave this section blank? If, for example, we have 2-4 Multiple Award Contracts, but less than 10 total Task Order awards combined, would we just not check any of the boxes?

Response: Amendment 01 added a check box for None of the Above. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

SECTION K

44. Question: Section K Representations and Certifications

Section L.5.2.2. states The Offeror shall complete and submit all Representations and Certifications in accordance with the instructions in Section K. Sections K requires the Offeror to check the applicable boxes. The solicitation files published on FedBizOps only contain Section K as part of the solicitation pdf file. There is no template or form which allows for the Offeror to check the applicable boxes other than hard copy.

What format does the government intend for an offeror to use when submitting Section K

Response: Print the required sections, fill in and/or check the appropriate information, scan the document, and submit it in accordance with Section L.4. See revised Section K Amendment 01.

SECTION L (Multiple Sections)

45. Question: Is the FPDS-NG Report you are requesting in Section L.5.1.2 and Section L.5.3.2.1 named "Contract Detail Report?" The "Contract Detail Report" can be found by clicking "Standard Reports" on the www.fpds.gov homepage and then clicking the "What" box in the top left corner. If this is the report you are looking for, can we delete the columns that you do not mention in #5? If this is not the report you are requesting, can you give detailed instructions on how to generate the report that you want provided.

Response: : For Section L.5.1.2. any report from FPDS-NG that ties the NAICS code or PSC Code to the project. Section L.5.3.2.1. is NAICS Code only. See revised Sections for more details.

46. Question: Section L.5.3.1, states "Any combination of U.S. Federal Government, U.S. State Government, International Public Sector, and Non-Government/Commercial projects can be submitted." In comparison, RFP Section L, Para 5.1.9 states, "When a Prime Contractor awards a contract to a Contractor, the Contractor is considered a "Subcontractor". Any evaluation element under Section L.5., Volume 1 through 6, for which an Offeror was identified as a "Subcontractor" **will** be rejected." If a company holds a contract with a commercial (OEM) provider that is not linked (or have traceable requirements) to a specific government contract (i.e., is classified as a "vendor") then why is that contract not considered a commercial project per the OASIS definitions? Asked differently, what constitutes a commercial contract?

Response: Contracts issued between commercial companies that are not in support of a Government contract are considered commercial contracts. Commercial projects may be submitted as Relevant Experience projects (L.5.3.1). Commercial projects may not be submitted as Pool Qualification projects (L.5.1.9).

47. Question: Section L.5.5.1, Approved Purchasing System; Section L.5.5.3, Earned Value Management Systems (EVMS); Section L.5.5.6. ISO 9001:2008 Certification. The Department of Energy utilizes Prime Contractors for the Maintenance & Operation of its Sites and Facilities. As a Tier 2 Subcontractor, all of our Systems are reviewed and approved by the Prime Contractors. Our systems, programs and clearances are audited by DOE when they audit their prime contractors. Can the review and approval of our systems by the DOE Prime Contractors be considered as another government agency for the purposes of this evaluation?

Response: No.

SECTION L.3. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

48. Question: Section L.3. The RFP states "Offerors are prohibited from modifying, in any way, shape, or form, any documents, printed or electronic, associated with this solicitation and any amendment(s) thereto." We request the ability to include corporate identification and proposal volume identifiers in the headers and footers of each page of our proposal. Will the Government allow required templates and forms to be inserted onto a page with headers and footers, which may cause the template/form to repaginate but will not change the data or style of the template/form?

Response: Yes.

49. Question: Section L.3, Proposal Submission Instructions, paragraph 5, states: "Offers are prohibited from modifying..." forms, attachments, etc. provided by GSA. Is it correct to assume that the offeror can add a corporate logo, page number, and proprietary disclaimer on government forms?

Response: Yes.

50. Question: Is it acceptable to make minor formatting adjustments to forms, i.e., page breaks on Excel tables for clarity and ease of evaluation?

Response: Yes, so long as the form content is unchanged.

51. Question: Section L.3 states: "Offerors are prohibited from modifying, in any way, shape, or form, any documents, printed or electronic, associated with this solicitation and any amendment(s) thereto unless specifically authorized to do so." Some of the information provided may be proprietary and the Contractors may need to protect the data from disclosure. Can the forms and documents be modified to include proprietary and non-disclosure language as a footer provided by the Contractor?

Response: Yes.

SECTION L.3.2. (NOVATIONS)

52. Question: The first sentence in Section L.3.2, says "By the closing date of this solicitation, if a Contractor has acquired another company, the Contractor may claim credit for the relevant experience projects, past performance, systems, and certifications of the acquired company, if applicable." If Company ABC buys Company XYZ, but Company ABC is not merging Company XYZ into ABC, can we still use their relevant experience projects, past performance, systems, and certifications if we submit meaningful relationship documentation and show that both companies are under the same parent company?

Response: Yes.

SECTION L.3.4. Proposal Due Date and Address Location

53. Question: L.3.4.. Would the government grant a 2-week extension for proposal submission while we await resolution of the prior question since it will impact our proposal strategy as well as our request and receipt of past performance questionnaires?

Response: No.

54. Question: RFP Section L.3.4, states that proposals must be mailed or hand delivered to Ft. Worth TX. Is it acceptable to ship the proposal via a service such as FedEx or UPS? If so, is the delivery address the same as identified in RFP L.3.4?

Response: Yes and yes.

SECTION L.4. Proposal Format

55. Question: Section L.4, Proposal Format Table. Please confirm that completed Past Performance Rating Forms, Attachment J.8 are to be included in our proposal submission with prescribed naming convention.

Response: Confirmed.

56. Question: Volume 2, Section L.4, Proposal Format Table L.5.2.1. Financial Resources, GSA Form 527. According to the Proposal Format Table, the offeror is to submit GSA Form 527; and it clearly states "limited to GSA Form 527 only." However, GSA Form 527 requires the offeror to attach certain documentation, e.g., trade style name filing in question 6 and "Prepared Financial Statements with notes" in Section III. Please confirm that it is acceptable for the Offeror to attach additional documentation and to create file names, as necessary, for these documents, such as: ABC.Vol2.527.A1.pdf, ABC.Vol2.527.A2, etc.

Response: Confirmed. See Amendment 01 to the solicitation. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

57. Question: Section L.4, in the Proposal Format Table for Volume #3 under L.5.3.1 through L.5.3.8 in the Page Limitation column, the directions indicate that, "Information shall be highlighted.", referring to information from Contract Documentation required to substantiate Relevant Experience for Primary Projects. As we have collected and highlighted our Contract Documentation to substantiate the Relevant Experience for our Primary Projects, we have found that there are sometimes hundreds of examples of services areas that represent the OASIS Core Disciplines within our individual Statements of Work (SOWs) or Performance Work Statements (PWSs). Is it required that we identify every example within our Primary Project SOWs or PWSs where an OASIS Core Discipline is represented, or is it acceptable to identify and highlight a smaller subset of examples (e.g., 3-5 examples) within the SOW or PWS that sufficiently demonstrates each of the OASIS Core Disciplines for each Primary Project?

Response: However much is necessary to validate the core disciplines is sufficient.

58. Question: Section L.4. The Proposal Format Table in Para L.4. and Attachment 7, both indicate, "Information shall be highlighted in the scanned documents." Will Adobe sticky notes also be allowed?

Response: Yes, any methodology of highlighting is acceptable so long as it is clear and easy to understand.

59. Question: Section L.4. The table's instructions for L.5.1.5 limit the Professional Employee Compensation Plan to 10 pages. Are these ten pages inclusive of a Cover Page and Table of Contents? We recommend the ten pages not include a cover page and table of contents.

Response: We have removed page limits from the Professional Compensation Plan.

60. Question: Section L.4. For those volume elements that require narrative or other non-documentary types of responses, what is the allowable font and size for text and tables. We recommend that for tables, the font be permitted to smaller than 12 pitch, so long as it is legible.

Response: Any font and any size between 10 and 12 is acceptable so long as it is clear and easy to read.

61. Question: Reference RFP section L, paragraph L.5.1.9. The RFP allows a parent entity to submit a single Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter that addresses all proposal elements. The table in paragraph L.4 allows for only one page for each MRCL. An offeror submitting a single MRCL may find it difficult to address all proposal elements within the one page limit. Request the Government allow a single corporate MRCL exceed the one page limit.

Response: See Amendment 01, Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

62. Question: Section L.4. Reference RFP Attachment 4 –Proposal Checklist, Volume 5 and Proposal Format Table L.5.5.10. Questions 12 and 13 from the Proposal Checklist. The L.5.5.10 in the Proposal Format table only provides for one file name for FCL with no clearance level indicated (ABC.VOL5.FCL.pdf). What file names should be used for responses to 12 and 13?

Response: We have removed the file for FCL. Offerors need only identify the FCL in the self-scoring checklist.

SECTION L.5.1.1. (SF 33)

63. Question: Section L.5.1.1., paragraph 2. The SF33 indicates that Block 19 is to be completed by the Government. Should the offeror complete Block 19 per instructions in L.5.1.1.?

Response: No. Block 19 was a typographical error. Paragraph 2 is revised to read as follows:

Using the SF 33 form, Solicitation, Offer and Award, posted as page 1 of the solicitation in <http://www.fbo.gov>, the Offeror shall fill out blocks 12 through blocks 18 accordingly;

64. Question: The instructions in Section L.5.1.1. Standard Form (SF) 33 indicate both the CAGE Code and DUNS Number are to be filled in on the RFP attachment **SF-33** (*“Offeror” means the official legal bidding entity identified in Block 15A on the Standard Form (SF) 33, Solicitation, Offer and Award, with a corresponding CAGE Code and DUNS Number in the CCR and/or SAM.GOV that matches the Offeror name on the SF 33.*). However there is not a box under Block 15A or anywhere else on the SF-33 released with the RFP for the DUNS Number. Where would you like the DUNS Number to be entered on the form?

Response: Only the CAGE Code is to be filled out on the SF 33 (Block 15A) In addition, the CAGE Code and DUNS Number is to be filled out on the SF 1408 (See Section J.6., Attachment (6). GSA will validate that the CAGE Code and DUNS Number provided by the Offeror in SAM.GOV to substantiate that it matches the legal bidding entity on the SF 33.

65. Question: The way that our company name appears varies across the spectrum of Federal contracts, customers, and various government portals. We understand that we are to represent our company name on SF 33 block 15A as it appears in CCR or SAM.GOV. That said, several of the files we submit for verification (things like contracts and ISO certification) may have a slight variation on how our name appears. Is it correct to assume that, as long as we can verify that the company name indeed refers to our company, there is no issue with this variation across the files we plan to submit?

Response: That is correct, but verification is necessary.

SECTION L.5.1.2. Pool Qualification and Certification

66. Question: The NAICS Table identifies Pool 3 as a size standard of \$35.5M performing in the NAICS of 541330, with Exception A, Engineering for Military and Aerospace Equipment and Weapons. Are we correct in our understanding that any proposed project for relevant experience in this pool must be specifically for Engineering for Military and Aerospace Equipment and Weapons?

Response: Yes. We assume this question pertains to the Pool 3 Qualification in Section L.5.1.2. The Department of Defense (DoD) may use Exception A for NAICS Code 541330. All solicitations must identify a NAICS code and business size standard. This is the preferred documentation needed to substantiate Pool 3 qualification, otherwise, the Offeror must substantiate through other documentation that the project was in fact for Military or Aerospace Equipment or Weapons.

67. Question: Section L.5.1.2 - "For an Offeror to be eligible for consideration under a given Pool, the Offeror shall have performed Two (2) Pool Qualification projects (OASIS SB) or Three (3) Pool Qualification projects (OASIS Unrestricted) under a NAICS Code or NAICS Code Exception that corresponds directly to a NAICS Code or NAICS Code Exception in the Pool being applied for." Section L, Paragraph L.5.3 requires five (5) relevant experience projects. These two sections appear to be in conflict. Consequently, request GSA modify the criteria in Paragraph L.5.3 to agree with the criteria in L.5.1.2.

Response: There is no conflict. There are three sets of projects, Relevant Experience Primary Projects, Relevant Experience Secondary Projects, and Pool Qualification Projects. Relevant Experience (**PRIMARY**) Projects are the projects that get scored and may have been performed under any NAICS code or no NAICS code at all. Relevant Experience (**PRIMARY**) Projects are subject to the requirements in Section L.5.3.1. Relevant Experience (**SECONDARY**) Projects are the projects that get scored for Mission Spaces, Multiple Award Contracts/BPAs and Task Orders and may or may not be a Primary project at the discretion of the Offeror and are subject to Section L.5.3.3. **Pool Qualification Projects** are projects submitted to verify that the Offeror has performed in an Industry corresponding to the Pool being applied for and may or may not be a Primary or Secondary project at the discretion of the Offeror. Pool Qualification Projects are subject to the requirements in Section L.5.1.2.

68. Question: Section L.5.1.2, requires that to qualify for Pools 3, 5.A, 5.B, or 6 an offeror must provide additional documentation to show evidence that the work performed falls under the NAICS code Exceptions associated with those pools. We understand this to mean that we must provide documents (e.g., the project RFP, PWS, or SOW) showing that the work performed on a particular project corresponds to the type of work associated with the NAICS for which the Exception exists. For example, regarding Pool 3, if we have completed work for a client under NAICS code 541330 Engineering, we can demonstrate qualifications for Exception A by providing an SOW containing work performed that could be characterized as Engineering for Military and Aerospace Equipment and Military Weapons to qualify for Pool 3, even though the work was not awarded as an Exception. Is this interpretation of the instructions correct?

Response: The interpretation you expressed is 100% correct. The size standard used by the OCO or whether or not an exception was identified by the OCO is not a limiting factor for the purposes of our evaluation.

69. Question: The Government defines pools based on NAICS codes. However, the NAICS codes were changed in 2002 and 2007. As part of the changes, the numbering schemes of some NAICS codes were changed. For example, in 2007, NAICS code 541710 became NAICS code 541712. Can we assume that contracts awarded under the predecessor NAICS code can be used to qualify for the current version of that NAICS code? For example, we were awarded a long term IDIQ contract in 2004 that used 541710, Exception A NAICS code. We were awarded many contracts under this contract including a number which were completed within the last five years. In FPDS, these

contracts are listed as having the 541710 NAICS. Can we assume that these qualify under the successor version of this NAICS, 541712?

Response: Yes, your assumption is correct. We specifically identify 541710 in Section L.5.1.2.

70. Question: Concerning L.5.1.2. This section states: "The Offeror has the discretion to choose any projects to meet this eligibility requirement so long as the projects have a Past Performance rating of 3.0 or higher (Past Performance rating for Pool Qualification projects is identical to the rating methodology used for Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects." If there are different contracts used for the requirements of L.5.1.2 than used for L.5.3, are Offerors required to submit PPIRS Reports or Past Performance Rating Forms for the contracts that are used to satisfy the requirements of L.5.1.2 subparagraph 4? If so, should where in the proposal should those documents be included?

Response: Yes, if different projects are used for Pool Qualification, then Offerors are to provide CPARS or Past Performance surveys in Volume 1 of their proposal. See Proposal Format Table in Section L.4.

71. Question: Section L.5.1.2. Note that the offeror must provide evidence that we have performed at least 2 projects within the NAICS codes identified per pool for OASIS SB and 3 projects within the NAICS codes identified per pool for OASIS. Are offerors allowed to proposed commercial contracts for these areas? If so, how can we provide evidence of specific NAICS codes given that commercial contracts do not have applicable NAICS codes?

Response: No. Offerors are not allowed to provide commercial contracts as Pool Qualification projects.

72. Question: If an Offeror does not have (2) projects (for OASIS SB) or (3) projects for (OASIS) that have (1) of the (2) NAICS codes (i.e., 541330 Exception A, B, or C) assigned to it, will they be considered as ineligible to compete for a Pool 3 MA-IDIQ task order contract? Or, will they simply not receive any of the 1,000 Points assigned to the Project NAICS Code Scoring System Section L.5.3?

Response: If we understand this question correctly, you are asking if you may apply for a Pool in which you do not have a sufficient number of Pool Qualification projects for. The answer is no. Relevant Experience Projects are different than Pool Qualification Projects. Relevant Experience Projects are scored. Pool Qualification Projects make you eligible to apply for a given Pool.

73. Question: Section L.5.1.2. In the event that the SOW for a contract under the appropriate NAICS code for Pool 6 does not refer to R&D for Aircraft even though the work includes R&D for Aircraft, what other documentation would be acceptable? Would a statement from the CO explaining the how the work is defined as R&D for Aircraft suffice? Please consider that submitting actual work products may be impractical and constrained by security issues.

Response: We prefer actual work products or contract documents but understand that certain programs may be sensitive. In these instances, a statement from the CO will suffice.

74. Question: Section L.5.1.2 says that to be eligible for consideration under a given Pool, the Offeror shall have performed Three (3) Pool Qualification projects (for OASIS) and Two (2) Pool Qualification projects (for OASIS SB) under a NAICS Code or NAICS Code Exception that corresponds directly to a NAICS Code or NAICS Code Exception in the Pool being applied for.

This seems to indicate that if a company was applying for 2 pools, there would be a need for six (6) distinct relevant experiences, three (3) for each pool for OASIS and two (2) for each pool for OASIS SB. Can GSA clarify this?

Response: Offerors do not have to apply for both OASIS and OASIS SB. If applying for both in the same Pool, the same Pool Qualification projects for OASIS could be used for OASIS SB. If applying for Pools 1 and 2 on OASIS, there would be a total of 6 Pool Qualification projects, 3 for Pool 1 and 3 for Pool 2.

75. Question: RFP section L.5.1.2, para 2.If a company currently has an MA IDIQ, can the company use two separate task orders (for OASIS SB) or three separate task orders (for OASIS) from that MA IDIQ as the projects for pool qualification?

Response: Yes.

76. Question: Section L.5.1.2 Pool Qualification and Certification. We request clarification regarding the Past Performance rating forms required for the projects an offeror will use for pool eligibility. To be eligible for a pool three projects with the primary NAICS code are to be listed. For each of these projects is a past performance reference required that has a rating of 3.0 or higher?

Response: Yes, for each of the Pool Qualification Projects, a past performance rating of 3.0 or higher is required.

77. Question: Section L.5.1.2. Can the pool qualification projects consist of a completed contract and a follow-on contract for requirements of comparable complexity if each meets the requirements specified in L.5.3?

Response: Yes.

78. Question: Volume 1, L.5.1.2. Pool Qualification and Certification, #5. Please note that our FPDS-NG reports do not show "Effective Date and Ultimate Completion Date," even for those contracts that are completed; however the final CPARS clearly shows the final period of performance as well as contract cost at completion. Please verify that GSA will accept a Final CPARS as verification of the period of performance.

Response: See Revised Section L.5.1.2.

79. Question: Section L.5.1.2. Background - If an Offeror has a legitimate reason that the NAICS Code for any project was reported in FPDS-NG incorrectly, the Government will allow the Offeror the opportunity to request and submit correspondence (letter or email) from a Warranted Contracting Officer from the awarding agency to identify the correct NAICS Code. Only a Warranted Contracting Officer authorizing a NAICS Code change is acceptable. The correspondence, at a minimum, must identify the project award number, the revised NAICS Code, a brief statement that supports the change, and the Name, Telephone Number, and E-mail address of the Contracting Officer. If a letter is provided, it must be signed by the Contracting Officer. If an email is provided, it must come from the Contracting Officer's official Government email address. The letter or email documentation must be attached as an addendum to Section J.3., Attachment (3), titled, "POOL QUALIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION"

To what GSA person / E-mail address should the Contracting Office send the correspondence?

To what GSA person / mailing address should the Contracting Officer send the correspondence?

Response: Correspondence should be sent back to the Offeror and submitted with proposal documents.

80. Question: Section L.5.1.2. Pool Qualification and Certification. For the Two Pool Qualification Projects (for OASIS SB) or Three Pool Qualification Projects (for OASIS), can a contractor use a GSA MOBIS or similar schedule/BPA where no task orders were awarded under that schedule/BPA as of yet as long as it is within one of the specified NAICS code for that pool?

Response: No. No task order means no performance.

81. Question: Section L.5.1.2.8, Pool Qualifications Requirement, Pools 4 thru 6, states: "To be eligible to compete for (subject pools), the Offeror must identify any Three (3) projects for OASIS and Two (2) projects for OASIS SB that has NAICS Code 541712 or 541710 assigned to it and verification documentation for the Exception on each project." Is it correct to assume that any exceptions listed for NAICS Code 541712 would also apply to any projects assigned NAICS Code 541710.

Response: Yes.

82. Question: Reference RFP Section L, paragraph L.5.1.2. Numerous documents are required for the Addendum to the Pool Qualification and Certification. To ease evaluation, will the GSA provide a format/table to submit the data for the information requested in the Addendum to the pool qualification and certification.

Response: A table with this information exists in Section L.4. "Proposal Format Table".

83. Question: Section L.5.1.2. The Offeror has the discretion to choose any projects to meet this eligibility requirement so long as the projects have a Past Performance rating of 3.0 or higher (Past Performance rating for Pool Qualification projects is identical to the rating methodology used for Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects). Are we to include submission of either PPIRS or Award Fee documents or Section J.8 Attachment (8)s for every Pool Contract referenced?

Response: Yes.

84. Question: Section L.5.1.2. This section refers to validating the NAICS Code either by a copy of the FPDS-NG report or a solicitation document that identifies the NAICS code being solicited under and the award document. If the award document reiterates the NAICS Codes in the document, is it necessary to provide the solicitation document, too?

Response: No. Any one official document demonstrating the NAICS code is sufficient.

85. Question: L.5.1.2. Pool Qualification and Certification. Referencing item 4, please specify what methodology should be used to collect the past performance rating for pool qualification projects which do not use CPARS.

Response: CPARS, Award Fee Documentation, or Attachment 8 should be used for all past performance ratings.

86. Question: Reference L.5.1.2. Pool Qualification and Certification. The Unrestricted RFP allows use of NAICS 541710 to satisfy Pool Qualification Requirements for Pools 4, 5A, 5B and 6. The SB RFP does not. Will the SB RFP be amended to permit use of NAICS 541710 for these pools?

Response: Yes.

87. Question: Section L.5.1.2. If a CPARS report or a PPIRS report is not available for a NACIS Pool qualification Task Order can we use a PP rating form or an Award Fee document as described in L.5.4.3?

Response: Yes.

88. Question: Section L.5.1.2.5. The RFP states: "For Pools 1, 2 and 4: To validate the NAICS Code assigned to a specific project, the Offeror must submit EITHER a copy of the Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG) report(s) noting the Offeror's Vendor Name, Effective Date and Ultimate Completion Date, and NAICS Code OR a solicitation document that identifies the NAICS code being solicited under and the award document to the

Offeror from that solicitation." Does this mean that, for the purposes of showing Contract Documentation for Pool Qualification, a copy of the FPDS-NG report(s) noting the Offeror's Vendor Name, Effective Date and Ultimate Completion Date, and NAICS Code will be sufficient - no other Contract Documentation (e.g. signed contract award form) will be required for this area (Past Performance documentation notwithstanding)? We recommend that this be the case, since the FPDS-NG information covers all the required elements OASIS is looking to validate in this area.

Response: Yes, we are only looking for enough information to validate the NAICS code or PSC Code and other information.

89. Question: Section L.5.1.2.5. The RFP states: "*The FPDS-NG report(s) must be attached as an addendum to Section J.3., Attachment (3), titled, "POOL QUALIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION"* The table requires that Pool Qualification Projects (L.5.1.2), be labeled IAW a specific file naming convention and not appended to any document at all. The table suggests the Contract Documentation and Past Performance documentation for each Pool Qualification Project be labeled ABC.VOL1.PQ.CD.P1.P1.A1 and ABC.VOL1.PQ.CD.P1.P1.A2 accordingly. We recommend that the verbiage in L.5.1.2.5 be changed so as to be consistent with the instructions in the table.

Response: We have corrected this in Amendment 01.

90. Question: In L.5.1.2., Offerors are directed to attach FPDS-NG Reports as addendums to Section J.3. Will the Government please clarify that the solicitation document AND award documents, submitted in lieu of a FPDS-NG Report, should also be attached as addendums?

Response: All that has to be provided is information sufficient to validate the NAICS code or PSC Code, awardee, and period of performance for the order being referred to.

91. Question: Section L.5.1.2 Pool Qualification and Certification

We assume the pool qualification projects can be any dollar size. Is this correct?

Response: That is correct.

92. We assume the pool qualification projects do not have to meet the 4 of 6 core discipline requirement. Is this correct?

Response: That is correct.

93. We assume the pool qualification projects do not have to be for a year duration if they have a rating in PPIRS/CPARS. Is this correct?

Response: That is correct.

94. Question: Section L.5.1.2 Pool Qualification and Certification. Besides NAICS code appearing in the table below list and the project being completed within the past 5 years, are there any other constraints for the qualification projects? Specifically, does project/contract value factor into qualification?

Response: No.

95. Question: Can two task orders for OASIS SB or three task orders for OASIS on a single IDIQ that was awarded under 541712 be used to satisfy the Pool Qualification and Certification requirement in L.5.1.2?

Response: Yes.

96. Question: Section L.5.1.2, For Pools 1, 2 and 4: One of GSA's previous Government-Wide Acquisition Contract (GWAC) vehicles was solicited using multiple NAICS codes for multiple size standards, up through 1500-person size standards (but not for the 541712 NAICS or any of the corresponding exceptions under 541712). Individual Task Orders (TOs) solicited under that GWAC did not specify NAICS codes at time of solicitation. If individual TO Statements of Work(SOWs) clearly identify research and development requirements, but neither the TO award nor the Master Contract (GWAC) under which the task order was awarded specify one of the qualifying OASIS NAICS codes, may a contractor include that solicitation and award document as a "Pool Qualification" project?

Response: If a NAICS code or PSC Code is not present for the master contract or task order, the project may not be submitted as a Pool Qualification project unless a signed letter by the contracting officer is provided that indicates the applicable NAICS code. The OASIS evaluation team will not make subjective determinations of appropriate NAICS/PSC code assignment for other contracting officer/agency work.

97. Question: Section L.5.1.2, For Pools 1, 2 and 4: Many small businesses who perform primarily in the IT Services and Program Management Services areas, and who have been awarded/performed larger "enterprise-wide" IT contracts have significant (read as tens of millions of contract dollars) research and development types of requirements within those larger contracts. But, because the preponderance of work for those contracts was IT, the primary NAICS assigned to the contract was, for example 541513, Computer Facilities Management Services. If individual task order statements of work (SOWs) clearly identify research and development requirements, may a contractor include those SOW elements from the solicitation and/or individual Task Order statements of work under those IDIQ contracts as a "Pool Qualification" project if there is appropriate separation of the value and duration of that task order work (i.e., specific IDIQ TO periods of performance and separate line items within the invoice for the task order value verification)?

Response: No.

98. Question: We noticed that none of the pools have the 561210 NAICS Code. We are currently the Prime contractor under the 561210 NAICS Code. However, under this contract we perform 3-4 of the NAICS codes listed in Pool 1. Can we utilize this contract as a reference for PP and simply highlight the applicable NAICS codes listed under pool1?

Response: No.

99. Question: L.5.1.2 Pool Qualification and Certification, paragraph 5: If a NAICS code is documented on the CPARS for Pool Qualification projects, would the FPDS-NG Report be required to be submitted as well?

Response: If the FPDS-NG report is available, submit an FPDS-NG report, otherwise, any contract documentation to identify the NAICS code is sufficient. There should be no contradiction between what is reported in FPDS-NG and what is on other official government documents.

100.Question: L.5.1.2 Pool Qualification and Certification, paragraph 4: If no existing past performance data (e.g., CPARS, award fee determination) is available, please confirm the offeror would submit a past performance rating form (Attachment J.8) to document minimum eligibility requirement of a 3.0 or higher past performance rating

Response: Confirmed.

101.Question: Section L.5.1.2 Pool Qualification/ Certification. For Pool qualification in 5A and 5B, NAICS code exemptions do not apply to large businesses. Why do large businesses need to demonstrate relevant experience in this exception?

Response: NAICS codes, and their exceptions apply to everyone. In order to compete for the type of work being performed within a Pool or SubPool, Offerors need to demonstrate they have performed in that area. Let's look at an example. Say Pool 6, which is a Pool based around a single NAICS Code exception for Research and Development of Aircraft, winds up filled with Contractors who have never performed Research and Development of Aircraft. This benefits nobody and is not in the best interest of Government.

102.Question: Our GSA PES Schedule was awarded under 541712. Can a Delivery Order awarded under this GSA PES contract whose scope is relevant to the Pools 5.A, 5.B, and/or 6 be used to satisfy the Pool Qualification and Certification requirement in L.5.1.2, even if no NAICS was specifically called out in the Delivery Order RFP?

Response: Yes.

103.Question: RFP, Section L5.1.2 Topic: Pool Qualification and Certification. Is it the Government's intent to prohibit commercial projects in support of this requirement? If so, why?

Response: The Government's intent is to ensure that Offerors have performed within the Government industry that they are applying for. This is a multi-billion dollar Government contract for complex, integrated professional service requirements for federal clients. Accordingly, we feel that requiring successful federal experience within the Pools being applied for is appropriate and reasonable. Our clients support this very strongly. Commercial projects are allowed to be submitted for Relevant Experience and Past Performance matters.

104.Question: Section L.5.1.2, can a single contract or task order (i.e., project) be used to satisfy more than one Pool Qualification? For instance, if a contract or task order under NAICS 541712 shows applicability to both Research and Development in Aircraft (Exception A) and Research and Development in Guided Missiles (Exception C), could that contract or task order be used as a pool qualification project for both Pool 6 and Pool 5B - if the Offeror submits evidence (i.e. SOW) that supports work performed in both Pools?

Response: Yes.

105.Question: RFP, Section L5.1.2 Topic: Pool Qualification and Certification. Since commercial projects do not usually include a NAICS code in the contractual documentation and FPDS for validation purposes, will the Government allow commercial projects provided that the offeror can demonstrate its applicability to the NAICS codes.

Response: No. Commercial projects shall not be used for Pool Qualification projects under Section L.5.1.2.

SECTION L.5.1.8. Subcontracting Plan

106.Question: Reference L.5.1.8. Subcontracting Plan. GSAM Appendix 519A and FAR 52.219-9 both require the offeror to include total dollars planned to be subcontracted for an individual contract plan and total dollars planned to be subcontracted to small business concerns. What should we use as the basis for developing the required dollar goals? Subcontracting opportunities obviously depend on the dollar volume of orders awarded and the type of work. Will GSA consider making requirement to submit subcontracting plans a requirement for delivery orders that meet the \$650K threshold rather than for the basic contract?

Response: The Federal Acquisition Regulations requires subcontracting plans at the Master IDIQ level. Offerors are to make a best estimate with regards to dollars. We understand that it is purely a guess at the IDIQ level and will treat it accordingly initially. As time goes on, these can be updated to reflect historical data.

107.Question: OASIS U only Section L.5.1.8. Will a Commercial Products Plan approved by GSA (as opposed to a different plan approved by DCMA) suffice to meet the requirements of L.5.1.8?

Response: No. A Commercial Product Plan is not acceptable. An Offeror may either submit an Individual, Master, or a Commercial Subcontracting Plan, however, if an Offeror already has a DoD Comprehensive Subcontracting plan approved by DCMA, the Offeror may submit that instead.

108.Question: Section L.5.1.8. Does the Subcontracting plan apply across all awarded MA-IDIQ contracts or will a separate plan be required for each awarded pool?

Response: Across all awarded Pools.

109.Question: Under Section L.5.1.8 Subcontracting Plan, "A small business concern as defined in FAR 52.219-28 is not required to submit a Subcontracting Plan, however, small business concerns that may outgrow their small business size status during the term of OASIS SB may choose to submit a Subcontracting Plan for the purposes of acquiring points for On-Ramping to OASIS Unrestricted." What points would be available if the scenario described above were to occur? Can a small business concern receive additional points under the current Oasis SB RFP for submitting a Subcontracting Plan?

Response: No. Submission of a SubK Plan by Small Businesses has no impact on the OASIS SB evaluation. Submitting a SubK plan, however, could potentially result in up 1,000 additional points when and if the Contractor were to try to on-ramp to the OASIS contract in the future.

SECTION L.5.1.9. Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters

110.Question: In Paragraph L.5.1.9, please clarify if and how subcontractor relationships may be used as relevant past performance.

Response: Subcontractor relationships may not be used for relevant experience or past performance.

111.Question: Under a CTA, are all teaming partners required to have a GSA Schedule?

Response: No. The OASIS contracts have nothing to do with the GSA Schedules program. These are distinct contracts.

112.Question: Under the CTA, is the team required to have a JV or Partnership Agreement?

Response: Yes.

113.Question: Section L.5.1.9 If a company has a teaming agreement currently in place on a particular contract and has been performing as the managing partner on the contract, can the contract performance for both of the parties be used for relevant experience (RFP section L.5.3) and/or pool qualification and certification (RFP section L.5.1.2).

Response: No. All projects submitted are to be as a Prime contractor. "Prime" Contractor means the Contractor has privity-of-contract with the Government for all contractual obligations under a mutually binding legal relationship with the Government.

114.Question: If we do not need to submit a MRCL, do we create a file that has the single line in it (named 'ABC.VOL1.MRCL.PDF') stating that we aren't providing any MRCLs?

Response: No. Simply do not submit one.

115.Question: Is a MRCL needed because our company changed its name during the course of some projects?

Response: No, but provide evidence of the name change.

116.Question: If our business is submitting as a dba, do we need a MRCL between the two company names, even if they are the same entity? In the example, "ABC Group A dba ABC Group B," do you need to see a MRCL between "ABC Group A" and "ABC Group B?"

Response: Yes.

SECTION L.5.1.10.

117.Question: Section L.5.1.10. Must all relevant past performance be accomplished solely by the JV and not the individual team members?

Response: Yes.

SECTION L.5.2. Responsibility

118.Question: Section L.5.2 Volume 2 Responsibility. A satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics is required. What documentation is required for EPLS verification? Will a copy of SAMS Entity Overview that displays no exclusion records satisfy this requirement? Will a copy of FAPIIS Search by Duns satisfy the FAPIIS requirement in Section L.5.2 Volume 2 Responsibility?

Response: This is not a proposal submission. GSA will do an EPLS and FAPIIS search.

SECTION L.5.2.1. Financial Resources

119.Question: Section L.5.2.1. Background - The Offeror must only fill in Section I – General Information, Section II Government Financial Aid and Indebtedness, Section III, Financial Statements, Section IV Income Statement, Section V Banking and Finance Company Information, and Section VIII Remarks (if remarks are necessary).

Is it satisfactory to use prepared financial statements for Section IV Income Statement, as is acceptable for Section III Financial Statements?

Response: Further instructions have been provided in Amendment 01.

120.Question: L.5.2.1. Financial Resources. Regarding the requirement that the Offeror shall complete and submit a GSA Form 527, Contractor's Qualification and Financial Information, located at www.gsa.gov/forms.

Are there instructions available for how to fill out the GSA Form 527?

Response: Instructions have been provided in Amendment 01.

121.Question: Financial Resources. Regarding the requirement that the Offeror shall complete and submit a GSA Form 527, Contractor's Qualification and Financial Information, located at www.gsa.gov/forms.

Reference Form 527, Section V, item no. 37 Maximum Amount Authorized (\$). The largest amount the form will accommodate is 99,999,999 . If the Offeror's Maximum Amount Authorized exceeds this amount how does the Government advise for the Offeror to report the actual line of credit value?

Response: Fill in the maximum amount and further details will be handled on a case by case basis if required.

122.Question: L.5.2.1. Financial Resources

Regarding the requirement that the Offeror shall complete and submit a GSA Form 527, Contractor's Qualification and Financial Information, located at www.gsa.gov/forms.

Reference Form 527, Section I, item no. 11 Ownership Information. The Offeror is a publically owned corporation and has many more than 5 stockholders who own between 3% and 8% of the business. The form does not allow for listing more than 5 stockholders. How does the Government advise for the Offeror to provide ow/nership information?

Response: Provide four and state "inquire for more stockholders" in the 5th slot.

123.Question: Section L.5.2.1. GSA FORM 527. Completion of this form requires additional pages to be attached that will not fit into format of the Form 527. Are additional pages allowed to be submitted with the Form 527?

Response: Yes.

124.Question: Section L.5.2.1. Regarding the GSA Form 527, the RFP states: "The Offeror must only fill in Section I – General Information, Section II Government Financial Aid and Indebtedness, Section III, Financial Statements, Section IV Income Statement, Section V Banking and Finance Company Information, and Section VIII Remarks (if remarks are necessary). The Offeror shall leave blank Section VI Principal Merchandise/Raw Material Supplier Information and Section VII Construction/Service Contracts Information." With the signature block being in Section VIII, and the government's instructions being to complete Section VIII only "(if remarks are necessary)", is it the government's intention for the GSA Form 527 to be submitted without a signature if no remarks are necessary in Section VIII?

Response: See revised Section L.5.2.1 in Amendment 01. Furthermore, signatures are required in Section VIII.

SECTION L.5.3. Relevant Experience

125.Question: L.5.3. Our company was previously the owner of a subsidiary company that performed approx. 40 task orders under Express Technical BPA in unrestricted competition. This subsidiary company has since become a JV, or which we are a 50% partner. Performance of these specific awards is within the 5 year performance window for OASIS. We would like to use projects from this experience set in our OASIS submission. We are not asking to use any other qualifications from this company, only the project experience that was gained while the company was a wholly-owned subsidiary. Can we claim projects awarded and executed while the subsidiary was wholly-owned as relevant experience on OASIS?

Response: Yes, but only for the timeframe where they were a wholly-owned subsidiary.

126.Question: Reference RFP Section L, paragraph L.5.3, paragraphs 1 and 2. Paragraphs 1 and 2 include the following note: "Note: The Offeror must substantiate all the information by providing enough evidence within a contract or task order document or other verifiable contractual documents to support each answer". Will the GSA allow Offerors to add a table with hyperlinks to the substantiation, in the contractual documents, used to support each answer?

Response: No. We will not accept hyperlinks. Scan and submit the required documentation. Please follow the instructions of the solicitation.

127.Question: In section L.5.3, Relevant Experience, Providing evidence within a contract. Two of our 5 relevant experience projects we wish to submit are classified. Can we submit classified documents to substantiate our claims, and if so, what are the steps we need to take to do so for this part of our proposal?

Response: At this time, we cannot accept classified material.

SECTION L.5.3.1. Pass/Fail Requirements

128.Question: Section L.5.3.1 of the solicitation states, "*Any combination of U.S. Federal Government, U.S. State Government, International Public Sector, and Non-Government/Commercial projects can be submitted.*" Do relevant subcontracts fall within the Government's definition of Non-Government/Commercial projects for this solicitation?

Response: No subcontract information may be provided for any proposal submission element.

129.Question: Since the OASIS SB DRFP clearly stated in section L.5.3.1, (*each as a Prime Contractor or existing CTA in accordance with Section*) and the final RFP does not have the phrase/requirement for the five distinct relevant experience projects to be as Prime Contractor, may offerors submit subcontract awards that fully meet core discipline requirement, size requirement per year, and all other requirements as one or more of the five projects required for the Pass/Fail gate?

Response: No subcontract information may be provided for any proposal submission element.

130.Question: Section L.5.3.1. The RFP states, "(Note: a project may be ongoing with less than One (1) year of performance only if the project has a past performance assessment completed in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) and finalized in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)". It is unlikely that Contracting Officers will have CPAR/PPIR information available for projects with less than 1 year of performance. Will the Government accept competed Past Performance Surveys in place of a CPAR/PPIR report for these projects?

Response: CPARS will, in fact, often be done for requirements where the base period of performance was less than a year. When the base period of performance is less than a year and that period of performance has been completed, a past performance survey may be provided. Where this is not the case, however, one year of performance is required.

131.Question: Section L.5.3.1, the Introductory paragraph states "A collection of task orders shall not exceed a total of 6 task orders" for a single award IDIQ. We understand this to mean that we may only use documentation from 6 of the issued task orders to show evidences of meeting relevant experience requirements (e.g. four or more disciplines, OCONUS place of performance, etc.) irrespective of the total number of task orders that were issued over the life of the IDIQ contract. For example if a single award IDIQ issued 20 task orders, that single award IDIQ contract can be

used as one of our relevant experiences and we can only use 6 of those task orders as evidence. Is our interpretation correct?

Response: That interpretation is correct. For the purposes of demonstrating core disciplines and formulating past performance (if necessary), up to 6 task orders may be utilized. However, for the purposes of dollar value and other scoring elements, all task orders under a given IDIQ contract may be utilized.

132.Question: Language requiring each submitted relevant experience project to be a Prime Contract was deleted from the Draft RFPs (formerly within a parenthetical at L.5.3.1). Instead, ambiguous 'outside a corporate structure' language has been added to the Final RFP at L.5.1.9 (Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, if applicable). Has the requirement to submit only prime contracts been retracted from the pass/fail/minimum requirements? It is unclear why the prime-only language has been placed in this other section, and whether it would only apply with respect to circumstances in which meaningful relationships must be established.

Response: No subcontract information may be provided for any proposal submission element.

133.Question: L.5.3.1 states that "any combination of U.S. Federal, U.S. State Government, International Public Sector, and Non-Government/Commercial projects can be submitted" to meet the pass/fail requirements for Relevant Experience. If offerors are permitted to submit commercial contracts, why then can't we submit U.S. Federal Government Subcontracts provided the value of the Subcontract on its own meets the minimum value thresholds, since such subcontracts are commercial in nature and would require the same methodology for validation of past performance?

Response: If the project is for Federal work, then Offerors are required to be the prime contractor. No subcontract information may be provided for any proposal submission element.

134.Question: Concerning L.5.3.1: How is value calculated for a task order with a length less than 12 months period of performance?

Response: In accordance with the formula provided within that Section.

135.Question: Concerning L.5.3.1: In the case where a "Task Order" under a single award IDIQ is used as a Primary Project and CPARS were only completed for the overall IDIQ contract covering all Task Orders under the IDIQ contract; would the CPARS be considered acceptable to satisfy the requirements of L.5.4.1 or will the Offeror be required to ask the customer for a specific "Past Performance Rating Form," as described in L.5.3.3, to satisfy the Past Performance requirements for this project?

Response: For a single award IDIQ, the CPARS information associated with the overall contract may be submitted if the individual task order does not have a CPARS rating.

136.Question: Section L.5.3.1.: The Offeror must submit Five (5) distinct relevant experience projects that meet the following minimum conditions:

Involve the performance and/or integration of at least Four (4) out of the Six (6) Core Disciplines for OASIS and Three (3) out of the Six (6) Core Disciplines for OASIS SB. The Core Disciplines are described in Section C and include Program Management Services, Management Consulting Services, Scientific Services, Engineering Services, Logistics Services, and Financial Management Services.

We read this to mean that not each distinct relevant experience must have at least the four (4) Core Disciplines for OASIS or (3) Core Disciplines for OASIS SB, but rather the five (5) relevant experience projects **when combined** must have at least the four (4) Core Disciplines for OASIS or (3) Core Disciplines for OASIS SB. Can you confirm this reading is correct?

Response: Your reading is not correct. EACH project must demonstrate four of the core disciplines.

137.Question: Section L.5.3.1 Pass/Fail Requirements for Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects. You clearly state that a collection of task orders – up to 6 task order – under a “Single-Award IDIQ or BPA” can be used for one of the five Primary projects. Does this apply to a “Multiple-Award IDIQ or BPA as well?”

Response: No.

138.Question: Reference RFP section L, paragraph L.5.3.1. Paragraph L.5.3.1 defines a potential project as a collection of Task Orders placed under a Single-Award IDIQ task order contract not to exceed a total of six task orders. The Relevant Experience template for such a project (attachment J-7, project 5 alternate) asks “How many task orders under the single-award IDIQ or BPA are being provided in order to identify the OASIS Core Disciplines performed?” and permits up to six to be identified. However, all of the scoring related information on the template appears to be applicable to all Task Orders placed under the IDIQ/BPA. Please confirm that the limit of six task orders is only applicable to identifying the core disciplines performed on the project, and all other data should reflect all Task Orders awarded.

Response: That is correct.

139.Reserved.

140.Question: Section L.5.3.1, Subparagraph (2). This clause allows as a primary relevant experience project a project that may be ongoing with less than One (1) year of performance only if the project has a past performance assessment completed in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) and finalized in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS).

One of our projected projects is a one year task order and will be 13 days away from completion on the day the proposal is due. If there is no CPARS assessment, will GSA accept a past performance rating form for the project?

Response: No.

141.Question: L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects, paragraph 1: If a Task Order under a Multiple Award IDIQ does not have a separate NAICS code in FPDS-NG nor on the solicitation (nor elsewhere e.g., referenced on CPAR), please confirm the NAICS code for the IDIQ would apply.

Response: Confirmed.

142.Question: L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects, paragraph 1: If a Single-Award IDIQ Task Order has 20 TOs, can an offeror submit TO1 as one of the 5 relevant experience projects, and TOs 2-4 (as a collection of Task Orders) as a separate project under the 5 relevant experience projects?

Response: No. If a single-award IDIQ contract is being used as a Relevant Experience example, ALL task orders under that contract belong to that single Relevant Experience project.

143.Question: For a Single-Award IDIQ/BPA, must all 6 task orders have been completed within the past 5 years or is it acceptable if only one or more of the task orders meets that criteria?

Response: Any one or more within the past 5 years.

144.Question: Given that a "relevant project" is defined in the cited section above in one instance as "a collection of task orders placed under a Single-Award IDIQ task order contract or Single-Award BPA" does the government intend that offerors CANNOT put forward a collection of task orders under a Multiple Award IDIQ or BPA as one of the 5 required projects we must submit?

Response: Offerors shall **NOT** submit a collection of task orders under a Multiple Award IDIQ or BPA as one of the 5 Relevant Experience projects.

145.Question: can I submit on only one portion of the required services such as photogrammetry & surveying or is it required to submit on all required disciplines?

Response: For OASIS SB Offerors must cover at least 3 of the 6 Core Disciplines, which include pricing for all labor categories. For OASIS Unrestricted Offerors must cover at least 4 of the 6 Core Disciplines, which include pricing for all labor categories.

146.Question: In the event that we are required to identify and highlight all activities that are examples of service areas which represent the OASIS Core Disciplines within our SOWs and PWSs, there are many instances where multiple examples of service areas are resident on one page of our SOWs or PWSs. In the interest of helping evaluators distinguish which highlighted activities represent which OASIS service areas and associated Core Disciplines, we are annotating the highlighted activities with the associated service areas provided as examples for the Core Disciplines in Section C.2.2 of the Final RFP. For example, our SOW may say, "Develop and apply numerical models for analysis and interpretation of observed ice sheet elevation changes." We highlighted this information and added an annotation of "SS4" for Scientific Services (Physical Sciences). Is it acceptable to submit our Contract Documentation with the substantiating information highlighted and annotated to assist evaluators?

Response: Yes.

147.Question: Section L.5.3.1.2. For the section "Relevant Experience (Primary) Project under an OASIS NAICS Code", the RFP States " For each relevant experience (primary) project, the Offeror must submit EITHER a copy of the Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation..." Does the government want a copy of each Primary Project's FPDS-NG information, or only the Primary Projects that qualify for these additional points? We recommend that the requirement pertain to only those Primary Projects where the offeror desires that points be awarded.

Response: Only those that qualify for additional points.

148.Question: Section L.5.3.1. For calculating the annual value of the Single Award IDIQ task order contract, are the factors for this calculation the annual estimates/obligations for the Single Award IDIQ task order contract overall; or are the factors for this calculation limited to estimates/obligations the 6 task orders selected?

Response: The annual estimates/obligations for the Single-Award contract overall. The value may include all task orders placed under that contract.

149.Question: Can the government please clarify how you intend to calculate the annualized project values for our primary experience projects?

Response: Please see Section L.5.3.1

SECTION L.5.3.2. Additional Points

150.Question: In section L.5.3.2.1, Relevant Experience (Primary) Project under an OASIS SB NAICS Code, it states for each relevant experience project the Offeror must submit a copy of the Federal Procurement Data System-Next Generation (FPDS-NG) report and the Offeror will receive additional points if the project has a reported NAICS Code associated to the project in the FPDS-NG system. Classified contracts by regulation are not reported in FPDS, so will the OASIS team accept another type of written confirmation from the Contracting Officer that a specific contract/task order falls under a NAICS code in lieu of that contract/task order being listed in FPDS?

Response: Yes. Any contract documentation or verification by the Contracting Officer will suffice. Please do not submit classified information.

151.Question: Volume 3, Section L.5.3.2.4, Relevant Experience (Primary) Project with Multiple Locations. Please clarify the method offerors should use to determine the number of locations a project covers.

Response: Please read Section M.5.1.4.

152.Question: Section L.5.3.2.6, Relevant Experience (Primary) Project with Ancillary Support Services and/or Products. Is it correct to assume that corporate-designed products, provided to clients, such as search tools and simulation tools, qualify as ancillary products? If not, please clarify.

Response: Yes. Any product supplied to the client as part of the project qualifies as an ancillary product.

153.Question: Section L.5.3.2.5, 1st Paragraph. If using a Contract with a collection of task orders as one of the Primary Relevant Experience Projects (as allowed by Section L.5.3.1), does the additional points for subcontracting with four (4) different entities mean that there has to be four subcontractors on each task order used or four (4) subcontractors over the entire collection of task orders for OASIS OR does the additional points for subcontracting with three (3) different entities mean that there has to be three subcontractors on each task order used or three (3) subcontractors over the entire collection of task orders for OASIS SB?

Response: For both contracts, the answer is the entire collection of task orders.

SECTION L.5.3.3. Secondary Projects

154.Question: Ref: RFP L.5.3.3.1; What is the SAT dollar value for this procurement?

Response: For the purposes of this evaluation, the SAT is \$150,000.

155.Question: Section L.5.3.3.1. I am collecting information for our OASIS proposal and have run into a bit of a snag. The "Other" category in the Mission Spaces section contains several quasi-federal organizations that we have contracts with but none of them use any of the specified federal forms (SF/DD forms) for their contract files. Is a copy of the executed contract considered an "Other Official Government Award Form from a Cognizant Federal Office"? If not, what is acceptable in these cases?

Response: Whatever award documentation the agency uses is acceptable.

156.Question: Section L.5.3.3.1, 2nd paragraph at the end says (See Section M.5.2.11 for the 5 Mission Spaces). There is no Section M.5.2.11 in the solicitation. Should the reference be Section M.5.1.10?

Response: Yes, that is a typographical error. Revise the reference from M.5.2.11 to M.5.1.10.

157.Question: Reference RFP section L, paragraph L.5.3.3.1 and L.5.3.3.2 In Sections L.5.3.3.1 (Mission Spaces) and L.5.3.3.2 (Multiple Award Contracts and Task Orders) GSA provided the following information:

Department of Defense (DD) 1155 – Order for Supplies or Services (Block 9 identifies the Prime Contractor, Block 6 identifies the U.S. Federal Government Agency, and Block 16 identifies the date the Contracting Officer awarded/signed). In reviewing the form, Block 16 indicates the type of order and has a place for the contractor to sign and date. Block 3 identifies the date of the order and Block 24 identifies the Contracting Officer signature. Recommend the wording for this section be changed to delete the reference to Block 16 and include references to Block 3 and Block 24 e.g. Department of Defense (DD) 1155 – Order for Supplies or Services (Block 9 identifies the Prime Contractor, Block 6 identifies the U.S. Federal Government Agency, Block 3 identifies the date of order and Block 24 identifies the Contracting Officer signature).

Response: We have corrected this in Amendment 01. Thank you for bringing this to our attention,

158.Question: Section L.5.3.3.2, Relevant Experience (Secondary) Projects with Multiple Award Contracts/BPAs and Task Orders. Is it correct to assume that a BOA under FAR 16.703, issued under a GSA schedule, is acceptable and meets the scoring requirements?

Response: No such instrument exists within regulation. BOAs are FAR 16, Schedules are FAR 8. Accordingly, we cannot accept this.

159.Question: Reference Section L.5.3.3.2, sub-paragraph 4 which states, "The Offeror may choose any project for Relevant Experience (Secondary)". Is it acceptable for the Offeror to select Task Orders from multiple award IDIQ contracts that are not listed in the NAICS Pools 1-6?

Response: Yes.

160.Question: Section L.5.3.3. Are secondary projects required to be with US government agencies?

Response: Yes.

SECTION L.5.4. Past Performance

161.Question: Section L.5.4. As a start-up, we currently have no past performance as a company. Can we submit past performance from previous employers for the 3 principals of our company? If that is not allowed, is there another approach you can recommend that will enable us to be competitive?

Response: Companies with no experience may not compete for an OASIS or OASIS SB award. However, the criteria for getting onto an OASIS contract are established and will not change over the life of the contracts, which is 10 years. Given the on-ramp capabilities contained in the contracts, your company could look to try to be on-ramped in the future.

162.Question: Section L.5.4, Volume 4, Past Performance for Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects. The second paragraph refers to Section L.5.4.4 as providing direction on substituting a Past Performance Survey for other forms of verification. Please confirm that the reference should be made to L.5.4.3.

Response: Amendment 01 corrects this error. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

163.Question: Section L.5.4.1. and M.5.2.1. Our experience is that CPARS ratings for single-award IDIQ contracts are completed at the contract level, and the evaluation encompasses all task orders performed during the specified period. One CPAR received specifically states "CPARS are not being prepared on individual task orders due to their cross-functional composition." Additionally, when CPARS are available it is common for our customers to point back to CPARS ratings when questionnaires are sent to them for completion. For a task order performed under a single-award IDIQ contract submitted as relevant experience, please confirm that the existence of a PPIRS/CPARS rating at the contract level satisfies the past performance requirements set forth in Section L.5.4.1 and M.5.2.1.

Response: Confirmed. We prefer this, but it is not always done this way.

164.Question: Ref Section L.5.4, Paragraph 2: Please clarify the required supporting documentation for RFP Section L.5.4 – Past Performance for Relevant Experience (Primary Projects). What documentation can be submitted if past performance is included in CPARS but is not currently linked to PPIRS? Is it acceptable to submit a copy of the most recent CPARS report that includes past performance ratings for the project? Or, if this is the case, must the past performance be documented using the Past Performance Rating Form in Attachment (8)?

Response: If the CPARS is complete and approved by the Government, it may be provided. Otherwise, the survey attachment will be necessary.

165.Question: Volume 3 Relevant Experience (Primary). Since commercial projects are not subject to the Government past performance rating system (CPARS), will the Government allow commercial projects provided that a PAST PERFORMANCE RATING FORM is completed?

Response: For Relevant Experience Primary projects under Volume 3, Yes.

166.Question: L.5.4.3. Past Performance (PPIRS information or Award Fee Determination does not exist)

Certain federal agencies' standard operating procedure is to submit past performance questionnaires directly to the procuring agency. Should the reference program contract officer decline to send a completed Past Performance Survey template (Section J.8) directly back to the Offeror, will the Government allow the reference program contract officer to submit directly to OASIS Program Office?

Response: No. Similar to the CPARS process, Offerors should know what their past performance ratings are and have the opportunity to discuss them with the rating official.

167.Question: Section L.5.4.3., paragraphs 1 through 4. The instructions contained in this section allow offerors to submit surveys directly to customer references in lieu of PPIRS Information. What activity is required for missing Award Fee determinations?

Response: Surveys are only to be provided when past performance does not exist in the PPIRS/CPARS database or Award Fee Determinations are missing or do not exist.

168.Question: We attempted to view and retrieve from PPIRS one of our relevant experience past performance projects, but were told by a PPIRS representative that it had been archived and could not be retrieved or viewed by

the contractor and not even by other Government agencies. We also spoke with a CPARS representative, who verified the same and also stated that archived CPARS would NOT be restored. How will GSA evaluate an archived CPARS given its age is greater than 3 years old, but within the timelines permitted by the solicitation?

Response: If CPARS is not available, and you don't have a historic copy of the report, then an Attachment 8 survey may be submitted.

SECTION L.5.5. Systems, Certifications, and Clearances

169.Question: Sections L.5.5.1, L.5.5.2, L.5.5.4. The OASIS RFP requires that the contractor supply documentation from DCMA, DCAA or any CFA certifying that we have the above approved systems. What other documentation will the Government accept to allow us to claim credit for these important areas? Will the Government provide help to contractors submitting OASIS SB proposals to have DCMA and DCAA complete the reviews so we can receive the required certifications?

Response: We have no control over the completed work or pending work of other agencies like DCAA and DCMA. Additionally, we do not want to make subjective evaluations of systems not approved by cognizant audit officials. DCAA is assisting us with accounting system reviews and we are very thankful for that. For other systems, however, Offerors either have approvals or not at the time of proposal submission.

SECTION L.5.5.2. Forward Pricing Rate Agreements, Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations, and/or Approved Billing Rates

170.Question: L.5.5.2 Forward Pricing Rate Agreements, Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations, and/or Approved Billing Rates. The requirement states: "Verification requirements include a copy of the Offeror's official FPRA, FPRR, Approved Billing Rates, audit report and audit report number from DCAA, DCMA, or CFA identifying the rates in the FRPA, FPRR, and/or Approved Billing Rates." Last year, we were informed by the DCAA that they no longer perform audits of provisional rates and issue formal letters. Instead, they consider the rates approved when submitted and monitor the rates during the year with quarterly updates to ensure that the billing rates remain in line with the actuals. Will it be acceptable to submit a copy of the emails from DCAA communicating approval of our rates?

Response: While we do not know the particulars of your situation, DCAA confirms that they issue formal rate approvals. For your situation, please provide the approving communication.

171.Question: L.5.5.2. Forward Pricing Rate Agreements, Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations, and/or Approved Billing Rates. L.6.2. Indirect Rates/Profit

Offeror assumes that the verification required in section L.5.5.2 must be directly related to the indirect rates applied in the pricing model per section L.6.2. In other words, Company Z would not get credit (i.e., 200 points) for providing verification of approved billing rates for Company Z's divisions A, B and C, if the indirect rates used in Company Z's pricing model were associated with Company Z's division D. Is this assumption correct?

Response: That is correct.

172.Question: L.5.5.2. Forward Pricing Rate Agreements, Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations, and/or Approved Billing Rates Offeror assumes that "current verification" equates to verification received after March 1, 2012; i.e., within 18 months of the closing day of the solicitation. Is this assumption correct?

Response: No. Provisional rate approvals have a validity period stated. Forward Pricing Rates Agreements (FPRAs)/Forward Pricing Rates Recommendations (FPRRs) are valid until rescinded/replaced.

173.Question: L.5.5.2. Forward Pricing Rate Agreements, Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations, and/or Approved Billing Rates. Offeror has received authorization from our DCAA Supervisory Auditor to use our provisional billing rates via email message. There was not official letterhead, an audit report, or an audit report number provided with the transmittal. Offeror has attempted to obtain official documents from DCAA; however, we have been unsuccessful. Please confirm that submittal of the email message from our Supervisory Auditor will suffice to receive credit for 200 points for section L.5.5.2.

Response: Confirmed.

SECTION L.5.5.3. Earned Value Management (EVMS)

174.Question: I have a question regarding Section L.5.5.3. Earned Value Management Systems (EVMS). The EVMS certification we have achieved as a company is project based and therefore expires when a project is closed out. If a company provides proof that they have achieved EVMS certification on a project that is now closed out, but was performed within the past 5yrs will they receive credit for EVMS?

Response: If you have EVMS certification that has not been rescinded, you may submit that certification for evaluation points.

175.Question: RFP Section L.5.5.3, Entire Section. Will the Government provide partial credit for RFP Section L.5.5.3 — Earned Value Management Systems (EVMS) to companies that have established EVMS processes, procedures and tools but no current EVMS ANSI/EIA Standard-748 certification?

Response: No.

SECTION L.5.5.6. ISO 9001:2008 Certification

176.Question: Section L.5.5.6. ISO 9001:2008 Certification. Can an NQA-1 Quality Assurance program be substituted for ISO 9001?

Response: No.

SECTION L.5.5.7. ISO 17025

177.Question: Section L.5.5.7 ISO 17025, NTE 1 pg for POC information: Per RFP requirements, ISO 17025 POC information cannot exceed 1 pg. The scope of accreditation to ISO/IEC 17025 issued to our company is 2 pages in length. Should a 2-page reference document be submitted?

Response: Yes.

SECTION L.6. Volume 6 – Cost/Price

178.Question: Section L.6: Must we list a cost for every labor category in the template, or only those typically used by our company?

Response: Offerors must provide rate information for all labor categories.

SECTION M.3. Screening and Evaluation Process

179.Question: Section M.3. Will GSA use only the M.6. Scoring Table to determine the order of offerors who undergo the Acceptability Review to determine the Top 40 and/or Top 20 that are also acceptable? If so, how will the additional points to be awarded as described in Section M.4. in accordance with Section M.5. be used to refine the Top 40 and/or Top 20 list that is identified at the end of the Acceptability Review?

Response: M.4, M.5, and M.6 are all inter-related. Offerors will be ranked by preliminary scores and then evaluations will be conducted to find the Top 40/20 Offerors with a Fair and Reasonable price within each Pool/SubPool.

SECTION M.4.1. Volume 1 - General

180.Question: Section M.4.1, states that a contractors accounting system must be determined acceptable or acceptable with a recommendation for an audit post award. For a bid to be compliant, does the bidding entity need to have had their accounting system evaluated by DCAA prior to response submission? Can the evaluation be pending?

Response: DCAA review of accounting systems is part of the evaluation process for apparent successful Offerors. All Offerors are to complete Attachment J.6 as part of their proposal submission, which will trigger a DCAA pre-award audit if necessary.

SECTION M.5.1. Volume 3 – Relevant Experience Projects

181.Question: Section M.5.1, Example 1. Example 1 indicates that if all the distinct relevant experiences have NAICS Codes that are in the list of Pool NAICS Codes, that contractor will receive the maximum of 1,000 points. The scoring sheet (Section M.6, under L.5.3.2.1 shows a maximum of 750 points. Examples 2 and 3 also seem to be based on the 1,000 point total score. Can GSA clarify which point total is correct?

Response: This is a typographical error. Examples 1 through 3 in Section M.5.1. are revised to read 750, 600, and 300 points respectively.

SECTION M.5.1.2. Relevant Experience (Primary) Project Value

182.Question: Section M.5.1.2. Relevant Experience (Primary) Project Value, 1st Paragraph and Line #1:

“For each relevant experience (primary) project submitted, using the same average annual value calculation methods in Section L.5.3.1., the Offeror will receive additional points in accordance with Section M.6., Scoring Table. if the annual value meets or exceeds the following: 1. Project averages greater than \$3 Million on an annual basis but, less than \$4 Million on an annual basis, including options.”

The Section M.6 Scoring Table on indicates a scoring range for a “Project valued at \$2 Million or more on an annual basis but, less than \$4 Million on an annual basis, including options”. Please clarify whether the correct range is \$2-4M, or \$3-4M.

Response: The correct range is \$2-\$4 Million. We have corrected this in Amendment 01. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

SECTION M.5.1.4. Relevant Experience (Primary) Project with Multiple Locations

183.Question: M.5.1.4. Relevant Experience (Primary) Project with Multiple Locations. Travel Duty (TDY) assignments for contract employees does not count for any location. For the purposes of the solicitation, may offerors assume the definition of TDY is the same that is in the Joint Federal Travel Regulations definition (change 318, 06/01/2013) which is as follows:

U4010 WHAT CONSTITUTES TDY TRAVEL

TDY travel includes the following:

1. An assignment away from the PDS that is not so frequent or lengthy that the location is, in fact, the traveler's PDS;
2. Participation in civil defense activities authorized under Service regulations;
3. Witness duty to testify/provide information on the GOV'T's behalf or on matters of official DoD concern;
4. Training course attendance conducted/sponsored by GOV'T agencies.
5. Attendance at technical, scientific, professional, or similar meetings and conferences sponsored/arranged by non Federal organizations;
6. Assignment as an attendant to a traveler with a special need/disability when the AO determines that the traveler is incapable of traveling alone on official travel (56 Comp. Gen. 661 (1977)); and
7. Change of command ceremony or funeral attendance (70 Comp. Gen. 200 (1991)) when the DoD COMPONENT head/designee determines that circumstances justify designating the traveler as an official

Response: Yes. The points provided for Multiple Locations is based upon permanent personnel at a location identified in contractual documentation.

SECTION M.5.1.6. Relevant Experience (Primary) Project with Ancillary Support Services/Products

184.Question: Section M.5.1.6 in both SB and Unrestricted OASIS RFPs states, "For purposes of this evaluation, Ancillary Support Services are defined as services that are not included in the primary scope of work of the project, but rather, are outside the primary scope of work, but are integral and necessary to the overall requirement." We are concerned about providing information in our proposal as examples of work performed "outside the scope of work" because federal procurement regulations (FAR, USC, etc.) prevent Contractors from performing work that is "outside the primary scope of work", unless it is authorized by the PCO. If the Government procuring activity authorizes work without changing the contract scope, there is a possible violation of the Anti-deficiency Act. If the work was authorized and approved through a Contract Changes clause, then the work is within scope and no longer fits the example requested by GSA for this evaluation/scoring element.

Response: You seem to be reaching far beyond what is being asked for. No credit will be given for work not included in the scope of a contract. The scope of work for any contract is defined in it's solicitation. For example, if a contract was **primarily** for nuclear engineering, but included some components of IT for fusion reaction modeling, the IT services are not the primary scope of work, but are a part of the overall scope as ancillary support services.

185.Question: Section M.5.1.6 in both SB and Unrestricted OASIS RFPs states, "Ancillary Support Products are project deliverables that are considered Government Property in the form of Equipment, Materials, Special Test Equipment, Special Tooling, and/or Property as defined in FAR 52.245-1, Government Property." We request clarification and possible re-wording of the term "project deliverables" because according to FAR 52.245-1, "Government property" means all property owned or leased by the Government, including both Government-furnished and Contractor-acquired property. So in both cases, this is property that was either sent to the Contractor

(i.e. Offeror) from the Government (Government-furnished) or from another contractor (Contractor-acquired). Therefore, it is not necessarily a "project deliverable" because it was provided to the Contractor (Offeror). Perhaps a more correct reference in the RFP would be, "Ancillary Support Products include receiving, managing, and/or using Government Property in the form of Equipment, Materials, Special Test Equipment, Special Tooling, and/or Property as defined in FAR 52.245-1, Government Property."

Response: The requirement states, "Ancillary Support Products **are project deliverables** that are considered Government Property..." If it is not a project deliverable, it is not considered an ancillary support product regardless of whether or not it meets the definition of government property.

186.Question: Reference RFP section M, paragraph M.5.1.6, and paragraph C.4. Section C defines ancillary support services as services not within the scope of OASIS that are integral and necessary to complete a total integrated solution under a professional service based requirement within the scope of OASIS. Section M states that "For the purposes of this evaluation, Ancillary Support Services are defined as services that are not included in the primary scope of work of the project, but rather, are outside the primary scope of work, but are integral and necessary to the overall requirement".

Is the Government's intent that services considered ancillary to OASIS would also be considered ancillary services for relevant experience projects? This would require offerors to substantiate ancillary services such as the examples provided in section C have been performed as part of the project. Otherwise, we are unclear how to demonstrate what the primary scope of the project was, so as to identify those services that are ancillary (i.e. not "primary").

Response: Do not mix Section C with Section M. For proposal submission, demonstrate the primary scope of work of the project by providing the portions of the Statement of Work (or similar document) that defines the scope and then provide documentation of the ancillary support provided. You are allowed an explanation to clarify the relationship.

SECTION M.5.2. Volume 4 – Past Performance

187. Question: Section M.5.2.5, 1st paragraph says If the Actual Percentage of Total Subcontract Awards meets or exceeds the Current Goal Percentage of Total Subcontract Awards, the Offeror will receive additional points for the project in accordance with the Scoring Table in Section M.6.

If an ISR shows that the total subcontracting goal was met, but individual subgoals were not, is this considered to have met the goals? As an example, subcontracting goal was 30% to small businesses with 3% to HUBZone. The contractor subcontracted 40% to small businesses but only 1% to HUBZone businesses. Has he met the goal?

Response: Yes.

SECTION M.6. Scoring Table

188.Question (OASIS SB ONLY): OASIS SB: The Section M.6 Scoring Table on miscalculates the 1st two lines under the 'Total Max Points Per Element' column for the L.5.3.2.2 scoring element – Individual Project Value. The values should read as 250 and 375 respectively, not 125 and 250.

Response: We have corrected this in Amendment 01. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

OTHER – General Questions

189.Question: If we are not claiming points for certain items, does the government expect us to provide a statement for each item that explains we are not claiming these?

Response: No. The Self Scoring Worksheet (Attachment 5A) will corroborate whether or not documentation is necessary for each scoring elements. In other words, if an Offeror is claiming credit for a particular scoring element in their self scoring worksheet then there must be corresponding file that substantiates the claim. If the Offeror is not claiming credit in their self scoring worksheet, there is no corresponding file necessary.

190.Question: If we do not need to submit a CTA, do we create a file that has the single line in it (named 'ABC.VOL1.CTA.PDF') stating that we are not submitting as a JV or Partnership?

Response: No.

191.Question: Will State & Local governments be allowed to use OASIS?

Response: State and Local Government may not use the OASIS contracts under current law.

192.Question: Large businesses with whom we have been talking to subcontract for OASIS Full and Open tell us no small business subcontractors are required by GSA for the bid? After award they maybe will want to talk about small business participation. Can you explain what is happening as the RFP has verbiage for small business plans. Is this just show and no substance within the RFP?

Response: Subcontracting is done at the task order level when an actual work requirement is funded and awarded by a customer agency. In regards to small business participation, OASIS Unrestricted Primes will have a 50% subcontracting goal included in their subcontracting plan. This is the highest small business subcontracting goal we know of in Government. Furthermore, there is an entire other contract called OASIS Small Business (SB) that is a 100% SB set-aside based on 7 separate small business size standards. Accordingly, we feel there is significant substance for small business participation on OASIS Unrestricted and OASIS SB.

193.Question: While reading through the documentation, I did not find any reference to NAICS Code 541511. I would like to know if this solicitation is open to 541511 code, since most of our work has been under this code.

Response: No. NAICS code 541511 is an IT code and as such, is not part of the OASIS contracts.

194.Question: We're a SDB/MBE that's had government contracts up to a few years ago. Over the last five years, we focused more on the commercial sector. We're now interested in cultivating more government work. As I read Section L.5.3 on Relevant Experience, I'm a bit confused. It says we can have commercial references, which is all we have for the past 5 years, yet we must submit data from FPDS-NG, which doesn't contain these commercial references. Are we therefore excluded?

Response: The solicitation calls for two types of projects: Relevant Experience projects and Pool Qualification projects. Relevant experience projects may be commercial projects and do not require an FPDS entry. Pool Qualification projects are federal projects that need to have been solicited under a NAICS code and/or have been reported under a NAICS code in FPDS. If you have done no federal work in the past 5 years, then you may not compete for an OASIS or OASIS SB award.

195.Question: The references must cover the NAICS codes of at least 3 pools. We're primarily in NAICS 541611, 541614 and 541618, which are all in Pool 1. You seem to be limiting OASIS to contractors that have on-going contracts with the government and that offer a broad spectrum of services, is that correct?

Response: There is no requirement to cover NAICS codes of at least 3 Pools. Pool Qualification projects need only cover the Pool being applied for. For OASIS, 3 examples must be provided for each Pool being applied for.

196.Question: Is it acceptable for a Small Business contractor to potentially bid on Pools 1-6 on OASIS SB, and also bid on Pools 1-6 on OASIS, given OASIS SB and OASIS are separate acquisitions?

Response: Yes.

197.Question: Let us know that how many total FTE's (Key Personnel) are required under this requirement? Do we need resumes to submit with response?

Response: There are no FTE required. Key Personnel are to be assigned, but they do not have to be FTE. Please see the Contractor Key Personnel duties at Section G.2.6.

198.Question: Our understanding was that this would be a teaming effort but now each company would input their own and team after when an task order is sent out? Do we just respond then to the areas that would apply to our company capabilities?

Response: Proposals are to be based on the Relevant Experience, Past Performance, and Systems, Certifications, and Resources of the Offeror only. We do allow for inclusion of meaningful relationships and pre-existing joint ventures, but otherwise, proposals should only reflect the attributes of the Offeror.

199.Question: Does the government require that interested vendors register in some fashion in order to be allowed to bid for OASIS SB?

Response: Not with us, no.